

The optimality of (stochastic) veto delegation

Xiaoxiao Hu[†] Haoran Lei[‡]

October, 2022

Abstract

We analyze the optimal delegation problem between a principal and an agent, assuming that the latter has state-independent preferences. Among all incentive-compatible direct mechanisms, the veto mechanisms—in which the principal commits to mixing between the status quo option and another state-dependent option—yield the highest expected payoffs for the principal. In the optimal veto mechanism, the principal uses veto (i.e., choosing the status quo option) only when the state is above some threshold, and both the veto probability and the state-dependent option increase as the state gets more extreme. Our model captures the aspect of many real-world scenarios that the agent only cares about the principal's final decision, and the result provides grounds for the veto delegation pervasive in various organizations.

Keywords: Veto delegation, Optimal delegation, Stochastic mechanism

We thank Navin Kartik and participants at various seminars and conferences for helpful comments. All errors are ours.

[†]Economics and Management School, Wuhan University. Email: xiaoxiaohu@whu.edu.cn.

[‡]School of Economics and Trade, Hunan University. Email: hleiaa@connect.ust.hk.

Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Motivating example	4
1.2	Literature	5
2	Model	7
2.1	Principal's optimization problem	8
2.2	Veto mechanisms	9
2.3	Characterizing the optimal veto mechanism	11
2.4	When are veto mechanisms valuable?	14
3	Comparative statics	17
4	Extensions	19
4.1	$v_0 \geq 1$	19
4.2	$v_0 \in (0, 1)$	21
4.2.1	U-shaped $\tilde{a}^*(\theta)$ and $\tilde{p}^*(\theta)$	21
4.2.2	Optimal veto mechanism can be deterministic	22
4.3	Risk-averse agent	22
5	Application to legislative rules	24
6	Concluding remarks	25
A	Appendix	29
A1	Proof of Lemma 1	29
A2	Proof of Proposition 1	30
A3	Proof of Corollary 1	36
A4	Proof of Proposition 2 and a numeric example	36
A5	Proof of Proposition 3	38
A6	Insufficiency of the likelihood ratio conditions	38
A7	Proof of Proposition 4	39
A8	Derivations of two cases when $v_0 \in (0, 1)$	42
A8.1	U-shaped $\tilde{a}^*(\theta)$ and $\tilde{p}^*(\theta)$	42
A8.2	Optimal veto mechanism can be deterministic	44
A9	Proof of Proposition 5	45

1 Introduction

In many settings of economic and political interest, a principal consults an informed but biased agent while contingent transfers between them are infeasible. The principal then specifies a permissible set of options, termed as the *delegation set*, and allows the agent to choose any option from this set. Holmstrom (1980) analyzes this delegation problem assuming that the agent's utility is determined by both the chosen option and the realized state. Holmstrom (1980) characterizes the optimal delegation sets in various settings restricting attention to *interval delegation*, i.e. assuming the delegation sets are intervals. There is a large literature following Holmstrom (1980),¹ most of which assume state-dependent agent preferences and focus on the optimality of interval delegation.

Nevertheless, in many real-life interactions the agent has state-independent preferences and only cares about the principal's final decision. For example, prosecutors may want favorable rulings only and do not care about whether the defendant is guilty or not, and financial advisors may recommend products with higher commissions regardless of the appropriateness of the recommend financial products. When the agent has state-independent preferences, any interval delegation set fails to elicit the agent's private information and thus the principal cannot benefit from the expertise through interval delegation. On the other hand, the interval delegation also seems incompatible with the *veto delegation* ubiquitous in many organizations. By adopting the veto delegation, the principal can only either accept the agent's proposal or reject for an outside option. The veto delegation has been used widely in the legislative processes and corporate governance. In the legislation, the veto delegation is termed as the *closed rule*, under which the constituents can either approve or veto the bill proposed by the committee. The closed rule is deemed to "constitute a critical component of managerial power in the contemporary House of Representatives" in the United States (Doran, 2010, p. 1367). A similar institution arrangement can also be found in China regarding the legislative process for the electoral system reform in Hong Kong. In corporate governance, the board of directors usually can only disapprove proposals but not unilaterally enact a new proposal. More instances of the veto delegation in other organizations can be

¹We briefly review the literature on optimal delegation in Section 1.2.

found in Marino (2007), Mylovanov (2008) and Lubensky and Schmidbauer (2018).

Motivated by these puzzles, we (re-)examine the optimal delegation problem under the substantial assumption that the agent has state-independent preferences. In the main model, there are a continuum of options and a continuum of states, and the agent’s utility is determined solely by the final implemented option. The principal is said to *use veto* if he chooses the status quo option. We show that veto mechanisms—in which the final decision is either the status quo option or some other option depending on the agent’s reported state—yield the highest payoffs for the principal among all incentive-compatible direct mechanisms. The arrangement of veto delegation implements the optimal veto mechanism.

1.1 Motivating example

To illustrate our main result, consider a political advisor (agent) advising a policy maker (principal).² There are two possible states, θ_1 and θ_2 . The policy maker is contemplating whether to bring up a new policy from $\{a_1, a_2\}$ or to maintain the status quo policy a_0 . The mild policy a_1 is suitable when the state is θ_1 , and the aggressive policy a_2 is suitable when the state is θ_2 . The policy maker wishes to maximize the social welfare: he obtains a payoff of 1 if the implemented new policy is suitable or -3 otherwise. Moreover, he obtains a constant payoff of 0 regardless of the state by maintaining the status quo policy a_0 . On the other hand, the political advisor has political leanings: her most preferred policy is the aggressive policy a_2 and the least preferred policy is the status quo policy a_0 regardless of the state. Suppose that the advisor obtains payoff i when policy a_i is chosen for each $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. Table 1 depicts players’ payoffs in each possible policy–state combination.

	a_0	a_1	a_2
θ_1	(0, 0)	(1, 1)	(-3, 2)
θ_2	(0, 0)	(-3, 1)	(1, 2)

Table 1: Payoff matrix of the motivating example

²This example is adapted from the think-tank game in Lipnowski and Ravid (2020), pp. 1632–1634.

Assume it's commonly known that both states are equally likely and that the agent privately observes the realized state. The policy maker's ex-ante optimal choice is a_0 , yielding a payoff of 0 for both players. Could the policy maker elicit information from this extremely biased advisor via delegation? The answer is yes. Consider that the policy maker commits to the following mechanism: if the advisor proposes policy a_1 , then the policy maker will approve; if the advisor proposes policy a_2 , then the policy maker will approve or use veto with equal probabilities. Given the principal's commitment, the advisor is indifferent between proposing either of the new policies. Suppose the advisor proposes policy a_i in each possible state θ_i for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Then the policy maker's expected utility is

$$\Pr[\theta = \theta_1] \cdot 1 + \Pr[\theta = \theta_2] \cdot (1/2 \cdot 0 + 1/2 \cdot 1) = 3/4 > 0.$$

The veto delegation arrangement as described above can be viewed as the policy maker delegating two *lotteries* to the advisor: $l_1 = (1 \circ a_1)$ and $l_2 = (0.5 \circ a_0, 0.5 \circ a_2)$.³ Therefore, the policy maker benefits from delegating his decisions to the agent when stochastic mechanisms are allowed. Indeed, one can verify that this veto mechanism yields the highest payoffs for the policy maker among all incentive-compatible mechanisms.

Later we study a general model in which there are a continuum of states and a continuum of available options, and obtain similar results—the veto mechanism, which is conceptually simple and relatively easy to implement, achieves the highest payoffs for the principal among all incentive-compatible mechanisms (Lemma 1 and Proposition 5). In this sense, our paper provides an explanation for why the veto delegation arrangement is pervasive in various organizations.

1.2 Literature

Our paper is mostly related to the literature on optimal delegation. Starting from Holmstrom (1980), seminal works in this literature include Melumad and Shibano (1991), Alonso and Matouschek (2008), Kováč and Mylovanov (2009), Amador and Bagwell (2013), Kolotilin and Zapechelnyuk (2019), etc. Variants of the delegation model have been

³Throughout this paper we denote a lottery with finite possible outcomes by $l = (p_1 \circ a_1, \dots, p_n \circ a_n)$ with $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1$, meaning that outcome a_i happens with probability p_i for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

used in political economy (Bendor et al., 2001; Krishna and Morgan, 2001), monopoly regulation and organization (Baron and Myerson, 1982; Aghion and Tirole, 1997), tariff policies (Amador and Bagwell, 2013), etc. Despite the vast body of literature, this paper is, to the best of our knowledge, the first to investigate the optimal delegation problem with agent state-independent preferences. Due to this substantial assumption, our result differs qualitatively from the widely-studied interval delegation (e.g., Holmstrom, 1980; Alonso and Matouschek, 2008; Amador and Bagwell, 2013). It's also worth mentioning that, unlike previous works, the optimal mechanisms we establish are stochastic. Indeed, any deterministic mechanism fails to elicit the agent's private information due to the agent's state-independent preferences. While previous works such as Kováč and Mylovanov (2009) and Amador and Bagwell (2013) allow the principal to commit to a stochastic mechanism, the optimal mechanisms in their main models are still deterministic.

As we interpret our result as demonstrating the optimality of veto delegation, we discuss the relationship between this paper and the growing literature on veto delegation (Dessein, 2002; Marino, 2007; Mylovanov, 2008; Lubensky and Schmidbauer, 2018). The above-mentioned works differ from the optimal delegation literature as they focus on the specific game form of veto delegation—the agent proposes some option and the principal either accepts it or rejects for an outside option. Fixing an exogenous outside option, Dessein (2002) compares full delegation and veto delegation and shows that full delegation dominates veto delegation as long as the conflict of interest is not extreme. Marino (2007) challenges Dessein's conclusion and shows the superiority of veto delegation in another setting with different assumptions of players' preferences and prior distribution. Mylovanov (2008) allows the outside option to be chosen endogenously and shows the equivalence of optimal delegation and optimal veto delegation. Lubensky and Schmidbauer (2018) strengthens the result of Dessein (2002) that full delegation usually dominates by explicitly characterizing the most informative veto equilibrium. It is worth emphasizing that unlike those works mentioned above, we adopt a mechanism design approach and the veto delegation arrangement emerges as the principal's optimal mechanism. Another important distinction is that in the above-mentioned works, the principal decides whether to veto or not *after* the agent's proposal; however, in our paper the principal commits *ex ante* to his probability of veto conditional on the agent's proposal to ensure information provision from the extremely biased agent.

Finally, our paper relates to the broader information transmission literature. The assumption of sender (i.e., agent) state-independent preferences is common in the literature of communication with hard evidence (e.g., Glazer and Rubinstein (2004); Glazer and Rubinstein (2006); Hart et al. (2017)) and information design (e.g., the judge-prosecutor game in Kamenica and Gentzkow (2011), pp. 2590–2591). There is also a growing literature on cheap talk with sender state-independent preferences (Chakraborty and Harbaugh, 2010; Lipnowski and Ravid, 2020; Diehl and Kuzmics, 2021). While this assumption is arguably of great empirical relevance, it has rarely been studied in the existing delegation literature. This paper therefore fills the gap.

The rest of the paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 presents the main model and characterizes the principal’s optimal veto mechanism. Section 3 develops comparative statics. Section 4 discusses some variants of the main model. Section 5 contains an application to the design of legislative rules. Section 6 concludes. Proofs and numeric examples are relegated to the [Appendix](#).

2 Model

There are two players, a principal (he) and a better-informed agent (she). The state of nature is $\theta \in \Theta \equiv [0, 1]$. Principal’s payoff function is given by

$$u(a, \theta) = -(a - \theta)^2 \text{ for } a \in (-\infty, M]$$

where a represents the chosen option or allocation and M is a sufficiently large positive number. Furthermore, there exists a special action $a_0 \notin (-\infty, M]$ yielding a constant payoff $u_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ for the principal regardless of the state:

$$u(a_0, \theta) = u_0 \text{ for } \theta \in \Theta.$$

We interpret a_0 as maintaining the status quo option or allocation. Real-life examples of a_0 include customers buying nothing from the intermediaries, investors rejecting the financial products recommended by the financial advisors, and policy makers vetoing the political advisors’ proposals for new policies. Denote by $A = (-\infty, M] \cup \{a_0\}$ the

action space. The principal’s prior belief is characterized by the cumulative distribution function $G(\cdot)$ whose support is Θ . Assume that $G(\cdot)$ admits a positive probability density function $g(\cdot)$ satisfying $g(\theta) > 0$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$.

The agent privately observes the state, and her utility function is:

$$v(a) = a \text{ for } a \in (-\infty, M]; \tag{1}$$

furthermore, the status quo option a_0 yields payoff v_0 for the agent regardless of the state: $v(a_0) = v_0$. Therefore, the agent’s payoff function is independent of the state.

Following the literature on optimal delegation (e.g., Melumad and Shibano (1991); Martimort and Semenov (2006); Alonso and Matouschek (2008)), we approach the delegation problem from a mechanism–design perspective and focus on the principal’s optimal mechanism: the principal first commits to some direct mechanism, which maps the agent’s report to a (possibly random) action; then the agent reports the observed state. The solution concept is *subgame perfect Bayesian equilibrium* (henceforth *equilibrium*).

One interpretation of our mechanism design approach, as in most applied mechanism design papers, is to find an upper bound on the principal’s welfare. Having said that, we also find the implementation via veto delegation fitting naturally into various contexts.

Assumptions Throughout this paper, we assume $u_0 \leq 0$. Otherwise, the status quo option a_0 yields the unique highest payoff for the principal among all alternatives in the action space, and the principal trivially chooses a_0 regardless of the state. We also assume $v_0 \leq 0$ in characterizing the equilibrium of our main model (Proposition 1) and discussing comparative statics (Section 3). In Section 4, we show that allowing v_0 being positive can drastically affect the optimal mechanism. Moreover, the agent is assumed to be risk-neutral by imposing payoff function (1). Later we allow for a risk-averse agent and show that the optimality of the veto mechanism holds (Proposition 5).

2.1 Principal’s optimization problem

We formally define the principal’s optimization problem. Denote the status quo option a_0 by some real number outside of $(-\infty, M]$. So $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ and we can express the principal’s stochastic action succinctly by a cumulative distribution function (CDF) over

\mathbb{R} . Given the agent's reported state $\hat{\theta}$, the principal's action is characterized by a CDF $F_{\hat{\theta}}$. Let $M(A)$ be the set of CDFs whose supports are A , and let $M_0(A) \subseteq M(A)$ be the subset of distributions with finite expectation and finite variance. A *direct mechanism* is a Borel measurable function

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha: \Theta &\rightarrow M_0(A), \\ \theta &\mapsto F_{\theta}.\end{aligned}$$

The incentive-compatible constraints are

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} v(a) dF_{\theta}(a) \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}} v(a) dF_{\hat{\theta}}(a), \quad \forall \theta, \hat{\theta} \in \Theta.^4 \quad (\text{IC})$$

Thanks to the functional form of the agent's utility, constraints (IC) are reduced to a set of indifference constraints:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} v(a) dF_{\theta}(a) = \hat{v}, \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta, \quad (\mathcal{I})$$

where \hat{v} is some fixed constant independent of the reported state. The principal's optimization problem is:

$$\begin{aligned}\max_{\{F_{\theta}\}_{\theta \in \Theta}, \hat{v} \in \mathbb{R}} & \int_{\Theta} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} u(a, \theta) dF_{\theta}(a) \right) dG(\theta) \\ \text{subject to} & \text{ (i) the indifference constraints } (\mathcal{I}); \\ & \text{(ii) } F_{\theta} \in M_0(A), \forall \theta \in \Theta.\end{aligned} \quad (\mathcal{M})$$

2.2 Veto mechanisms

Denote by H_a the CDF of a degenerate distribution that puts mass one on some specific option $a \in A$. For any mechanism $\alpha: \theta \mapsto F_{\theta}$, we call it a *veto mechanism* if for each θ , there exist some action $\tilde{a}(\theta) \neq a_0$ and some number $\tilde{p}(\theta) \in [0, 1]$ such that $F_{\theta} = \tilde{p}(\theta)H_{a_0} + (1 - \tilde{p}(\theta))H_{\tilde{a}(\theta)}$.

⁴Integrals throughout this paper are Lebesgue–Stieltjes integrals.

Definition 1. A mechanism $\alpha : \Theta \rightarrow M_0(A)$ is a *veto mechanism* if $\alpha(\theta)$ is a two-point distribution satisfying $a_0 \in \text{supp } \alpha(\theta)$ for each $\theta \in \Theta$.

The notion of veto mechanism corresponds to the veto delegation institution in which the agent proposes some action $\tilde{a}(\theta)$ and then the principal can either accept it or reject it for the status quo option a_0 . A veto mechanism is characterized by the pair $(\tilde{a}(\cdot), \tilde{p}(\cdot))$ where $\tilde{a} : \Theta \rightarrow A$ maps each state to some action $\tilde{a}(\theta) \neq a_0$ and $\tilde{p} : \Theta \rightarrow [0, 1]$ maps each state to the veto probability (i.e., the probability of choosing the status quo option).

A mechanism is *incentive-compatible* if it satisfies the indifference constraints (\mathcal{I}) . The following proposition implies that we can focus on veto mechanisms when searching for a principal's optimal incentive-compatible mechanism.

Lemma 1. *For any incentive-compatible mechanism α , there exists a veto mechanism α' yielding a weakly higher expected utility for the principal.*

Proof. See Appendix A1. □

The proof sketch of Lemma 1 is as follows. First, any CDF $F \in M_0(A)$ can be written as a convex combination of a degenerate distribution H_{a_0} that puts mass one on the status quo option and some other distribution \hat{F} whose support is a subset of $(-\infty, M]$. Restricting attention to incentive-compatible mechanisms with any fixed agent equilibrium payoff \hat{v} , it can be verified that the principal's equilibrium payoff is maximized only if \hat{F} is degenerate. Put differently, when \hat{F} is not a degenerate distribution, there must exist another incentive-compatible mechanism yielding higher payoffs for the principal. The intuition for the optimality of a degenerate \hat{F} is as follows. Fixing \hat{v} and the coefficients in the convex representation of F , the feasible \hat{F} 's are with the same expectation. As the principal is risk-averse and detests variance, his preferred \hat{F} is degenerate.

The assumption of a risk-neutral agent provides the analytical convenience that allows for comparative statics. For those reasons we stick to the risk-neutral setting in our main analysis. Nevertheless, the optimality of veto mechanisms still hold when we allow for a risk-averse agent (Proposition 5).

2.3 Characterizing the optimal veto mechanism

We first briefly discuss the extreme case when $u_0 = 0$. In this case, the principal cannot do better than opting for the status quo option, and there exists a trivial equilibrium in which he maintains the status quo regardless of the state. Nevertheless, there also exists a (fully) separating equilibrium in which the agent is strictly better off. In the separating equilibrium, the principal commits to the veto mechanism $(\tilde{a}^*(\cdot), \tilde{p}^*(\cdot))$ where $\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \theta$ and $\tilde{p}^*(\theta) = \theta/(\theta - v_0)$. In other words, given the agent's reported state $\hat{\theta}$, the principal uses veto with probability $\frac{\hat{\theta}}{\hat{\theta} - v_0}$ and chooses option $\tilde{a}(\hat{\theta}) = \hat{\theta}$ with the complementary probability. This mechanism is incentive-compatible and the principal's equilibrium payoff is the same as that in the previous trivial equilibrium. However, the agent's equilibrium payoff is $\tilde{p}(\theta)v_0 + (1 - \tilde{p}(\theta))\theta = 0$ in each state, which is higher than the payoff v_0 in the trivial equilibrium. This separating equilibrium is the limiting case of the equilibria with $u_0 < 0$ as discussed below.

From now on, assume $u_0 < 0$. By Lemma 1, we focus on the veto mechanisms, and accordingly the principal's maximization problem (\mathcal{M}) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\{\tilde{p}(\theta), \tilde{a}(\theta)\}_{\theta \in \Theta}, \hat{v}} \int_{\Theta} \left(\tilde{p}(\theta)u_0 - (1 - \tilde{p}(\theta))(\tilde{a}(\theta) - \theta)^2 \right) dG(\theta) \\ & \text{subject to (i) } \forall \theta \in \Theta, \tilde{p}(\theta)v_0 + (1 - \tilde{p}(\theta))\tilde{a}(\theta) = \hat{v}; \\ & \quad \text{(ii) } \forall \theta \in \Theta, \tilde{p}(\theta) \in [0, 1] \text{ and } \tilde{a}(\theta) \in (-\infty, M]. \end{aligned} \tag{\mathcal{M}'}$$

Note that perturbing $\tilde{p}(\theta')$ and $\tilde{a}(\theta')$ at state $\theta = \theta'$ will not affect the validity of constraints (\mathcal{I}) for other states $\theta \neq \theta'$ as long as the agent's expected payoff is fixed at \hat{v} when reporting θ' . Due to that observation, we first fix $\hat{v} \in [v_0, 1]$ and solve the principal's maximization problem by maximizing each integrand *state-wisely*; then we solve for the optimal \hat{v} . Accordingly, problem (\mathcal{M}') reduces to the two-step maximization problems as below.

1. For each $\theta \in \Theta$ and $\hat{v} \in [v_0, 1]$, we solve the following optimization problem:

$$\pi(\hat{v}, \theta) \equiv \max_{\tilde{p}(\theta), \tilde{a}(\theta)} \tilde{p}(\theta)u_0 - (1 - \tilde{p}(\theta))(\tilde{a}(\theta) - \theta)^2 \tag{\mathcal{M}_1}$$

- subject to (i) $\tilde{p}(\theta)v_0 + (1 - \tilde{p}(\theta))\tilde{a}(\theta) = \hat{v}$;
(ii) $\tilde{p}(\theta) \in [0, 1]$ and $\tilde{a}(\theta) \in (-\infty, M]$.

2. We solve for the optimal \hat{v} :

$$\max_{\hat{v} \in [v_0, 1]} \int_{\Theta} \pi(\hat{v}, \theta) g(\theta) d\theta. \quad (\mathcal{M}_2)$$

We solve the sequential problems (\mathcal{M}_1) and (\mathcal{M}_2) using the standard method of Lagrange multipliers. The optimal veto mechanism is summarized in Proposition 1.

Proposition 1. *Assume $v_0 \leq 0$.*

- (a) *If $(1 - v_0)^2 + u_0 > (\mathbb{E}_G(\theta) - v_0)^2$, then define $\eta(\theta) \equiv \sqrt{(\theta - v_0)^2 + u_0} + v_0$ for $\theta \geq \sqrt{-u_0} + v_0$ and the optimal veto mechanism $(\tilde{a}^*(\cdot), \tilde{p}^*(\cdot))$ is*

$$\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \begin{cases} \bar{a}, & \text{if } \theta < \bar{\theta}; \\ \eta(\theta), & \text{if } \theta \geq \bar{\theta}, \end{cases} \quad \tilde{p}^*(\theta) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \theta < \bar{\theta}; \\ \frac{\eta(\theta) - \bar{a}}{\eta(\theta) - v_0}, & \text{if } \theta \geq \bar{\theta}, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where $\bar{\theta} \equiv \eta^{-1}(\bar{a})$ and \bar{a} is determined by $\int_{\eta^{-1}(\bar{a})}^1 (\eta(\theta) - \bar{a}) dG(\theta) + \bar{a} - \mathbb{E}_G(\theta) = 0$. Moreover, $\bar{a} \in (0, \mathbb{E}_G(\theta))$.

- (b) *If $(1 - v_0)^2 + u_0 \leq (\mathbb{E}_G(\theta) - v_0)^2$, then the optimal veto mechanism is characterized by $\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$ and $\tilde{p}^*(\theta) = 0$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$; that is, the principal chooses $\mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$ regardless of the state.*

Proof. See Appendix A2. □

In case (a) of Proposition 1, the principal benefits from eliciting the agent's private information. Figure 1 illustrates the optimal veto mechanism in this case: the principal's choices are pooled at the deterministic action \bar{a} when the state is below the threshold $\bar{\theta}$; when the state is above the threshold $\bar{\theta}$, the principal uses veto with probability $\frac{\eta(\theta) - \bar{a}}{\eta(\theta) - v_0}$ and chooses $\eta(\theta)$ with the complementary probability. In case (b), the principal trivially delegates $\{\mathbb{E}_G(\theta)\}$.




Figure 1: Optimal veto mechanism

Implementations One implementation of the non-trivial optimal veto mechanism is that the principal delegates a set of lotteries $\{l_\theta\}_{\theta \in [\bar{\theta}, 1]}$ indexed by θ to the agent where

$$l_\theta = \left(\tilde{p}^*(\theta) \circ a_0, (1 - \tilde{p}^*(\theta)) \circ \eta(\theta) \right) \text{ for } \theta \in [\bar{\theta}, 1].$$

At state θ , the agent chooses l_θ if $\theta \in [\bar{\theta}, 1]$ and otherwise chooses $l_{\bar{\theta}}$. Another implementation is via the veto delegation arrangement that the agent proposes some option and the principal either uses veto or not. Specifically, the principal pre-commits to the mixed strategy as described below: the principal uses veto with probability $\tilde{p}^*(\eta^{-1}(\hat{a}))$ if the proposed option $\hat{a} \in [\bar{a}, \eta(1)]$, always approves if $\hat{a} \in [0, \bar{a}]$ and otherwise always uses veto.

Figure 1 suggests that both $\tilde{a}^*(\theta)$ and $\tilde{p}^*(\theta)$ are weakly increasing in θ and, perhaps surprisingly, that action $\tilde{a}^*(\theta)$ is strictly lower than θ for all $\theta > \bar{\theta}$. We summarize these properties in Corollary 1, which can be verified directly from the corresponding expressions.

Corollary 1. *Among all valuable optimal veto mechanisms,*

- (a) $\tilde{a}^*(\theta)$ and $\tilde{p}^*(\theta)$ are weakly increasing in θ ;
- (b) $\tilde{a}^*(\theta) < \theta$ for all $\theta > \bar{\theta}$.

Proof. See Appendix A3. □

The intuition of Corollary 1(a) is as follows. As the state θ increases, the principal's preferred option gets higher and thus $\tilde{a}^*(\theta)$ is weakly increasing. On the other hand, to maintain the indifference constraints (\mathcal{I}), the principal has to veto those higher options with higher probabilities. So $\tilde{p}^*(\cdot)$ is weakly increasing as well. Corollary 1(b) claims that in the optimal veto mechanism the proposed option is always lower than the state, and its intuition is as follows. First let $\tilde{a}(\theta) = \theta$ for $\theta > \bar{\theta}$ and consider a marginal decrease of the proposed option. The principal's utility conditional on not using veto decreases, but that loss is of second-order.⁵ On the other hand, constraints (\mathcal{I}) imply that a lower proposal necessitates a lower veto probability. As the status quo option yields payoffs $u_0 < 0$ for the principal, the gain from a marginal downward deviation from the state-matching action is first-order. To sum up, it benefits the principal to design the options $\tilde{a}(\theta)$ lower than θ .

2.4 When are veto mechanisms valuable?

We say a veto mechanism is *valuable* if it yields a higher payoff for the principal than that of delegating $\{\mathbb{E}_G(\theta)\}$. By Proposition 1, whether there exists a valuable veto mechanism depends on players' payoffs from the status quo option, u_0 and v_0 , and the mean of belief distribution $G(\cdot)$.

Effects of u_0 As $v_0 \leq 0$, the status quo option a_0 serves as a punishment option to balance the constraints (\mathcal{I}). Proposition 1 implies that the optimal veto mechanism is valuable if and only if $u_0 > (\mathbb{E}_G(\theta) - v_0)^2 - (1 - v_0)^2$. Put in other words, the status quo alternative serves as a valid punishment option only if it does not harm the principal that much. Indeed, when $u_0 \leq 2v_0 - 1$, there does not exist a valuable veto mechanism no matter what the principal's prior belief is. On the other hand, the restriction on u_0 for the existence of valuable veto mechanisms is not strict. It can be verified that a_0 can serve as a valid punishment option even when u_0 is significantly less than the principal's

⁵As the principal's utility function is quadratic for $a \in (\infty, M]$, the first-order derivative with respect to a at $a = \theta$ is zero: $\frac{\partial u(a, \theta)}{\partial a} \Big|_{a=\theta} = 0$ for all $\theta > \bar{\theta}$.

payoff from choosing his ex-ante preferred option $\mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$.⁶

Effects of v_0 The lower bound of u_0 for the existence of a valuable veto mechanism, $(\mathbb{E}_G(\theta) - v_0)^2 - (1 - v_0)^2$, is increasing in v_0 . The intuition is that when v_0 gets larger, the degree of punishment by veto becomes less severe for the agent. Then the principal has to punish the agent with higher probabilities in order to maintain the constraints (\mathcal{I}) . Therefore, the principal obtains the status quo payoff more often, making the veto mechanism harder to sustain.

Effects of prior distribution G The optimal veto mechanism is valuable only if u_0 is above the threshold $-(1 - v_0)^2$. In that case, the necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of valuable veto mechanisms can be written more parsimoniously as $\mathbb{E}_G(\theta) < \eta(1) \equiv \sqrt{(1 - v_0)^2 + u_0} + v_0$. Fixing u_0 and v_0 (and henceforth $\eta(1)$), the existence of valuable veto mechanisms depends only on the mean of the prior distribution G . As the principal's ex-post preferred option is $a = \theta$ and the agent always prefers higher actions regardless of the state, a higher $\mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$ indicates that the two players' interests are more aligned ex ante. In this sense, Proposition 1 implies that veto mechanisms are not valuable when the interests of two players are sufficiently aligned (i.e., $\mathbb{E}_G(\theta) > \eta(1)$). This finding is in contrast with the *Ally Principle* that greater alignment leads to more discretion in the delegation set.⁷ In our setting, the principal leaves no discretion for the principal and delegates $\{\mathbb{E}_G(\theta)\}$ trivially when players' preferences are sufficiently aligned.

In a related paper, Kartik, Kleiner and Van Weelden (2021) document the invalidity of Ally Principle in a bargaining environment—a proposer (principal) delegates a set of lotteries for a vetoer (agent) to choose from while the vetoer can always choose to maintain the status quo besides the delegated options. In Kartik et al. (2021), the opposite of the Ally Principle is true: greater ex-ante alignment tends to make the

⁶For an illustration, let the prior belief be uniform over Θ and set $v_0 = 0$. Then the status quo option can serve as a valid punishment option as long as u_0 is higher than $-3/4$, which is significantly less than $-1/12$ —the principal's payoff from choosing $\mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$.

⁷The Ally Principle has been shown to hold in a number of models in the political economy literature (See Bendor, Glazer and Hammond (2001) and the discussions therein). Holmstrom (1980) demonstrates that the Ally Principle holds under general conditions when restricting to interval delegations.

principal leave less discretion for the agent (i.e., the delegation set gets strictly smaller). In a standard optimal delegation setting, Alonso and Matouschek (2008, Section 6.4) illustrate that the Ally Principle may fail when the optimal deterministic mechanism is not interval delegation. In this paper, the Ally Principle in general does not hold—the delegation set gets neither strictly smaller nor bigger as players have greater ex-ante preference alignment.⁸

A better understanding of the effects of G can be gained by examining the threshold \bar{a} more closely. The first-order condition determining \bar{a} permits a graphical expression as in Figure 2, where \bar{a} and $\bar{\theta} \equiv \eta^{-1}(\bar{a})$ are the exact values that equalize the areas of the two shaded regions weighted by distribution G . Since $\eta(1) < 1$, when the distribution $G(\theta)$ puts too much mass on the interval $(1 - \epsilon, 1)$ for a sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, \bar{a} would be above $\eta(1)$ and then the principal delegates $\{\mathbb{E}_G(\theta)\}$. Therefore, when $\mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$ is sufficiently high, there will be no valuable veto mechanisms.




Figure 2: Pinning down the thresholds \bar{a} and $\bar{\theta}$

⁸It's worth noting that in most papers where the Ally Principle holds, the degree of preferences misalignment is measured by some bias parameter and is constant across different states. In contrast, both Kartik et al. (2021) and our paper assume one player having state-independent preferences, and thus the degree of (ex-ante) preferences alignment is belief-dependent. In the counter-example of Alonso and Matouschek (2008), players' preference misalignment is not constant across states and is larger at higher states.

3 Comparative statics

We first derive comparative statics concerning the value of the status quo option for the agent.

Proposition 2. *Among all valuable optimal veto mechanisms, if the value of status quo alternative for the agent v_0 is higher, then*

- (a) *separating actions $\eta(\theta)$ decreases for each possible θ ;*
- (b) *cutoffs \bar{a} and $\bar{\theta}$ both increase.*

Proof. See Appendix A4. □




Figure 3: Changes of $\tilde{a}^*(\theta)$ when v_0 increases to v'_0

The intuition of Proposition 2 (illustrated by Figure 3) is as follows. Higher v_0 means that the agent's payoff from the status quo option is higher, which directly increases the agent's equilibrium payoff \bar{a} . Moreover, higher v_0 also means that punishment by veto becomes less severe for the agent. To maintain the indifference constraints (I), the principal tends to lower the separating action $\eta(\theta)$. Finally, the cutoff state $\bar{\theta} \equiv \eta^{-1}(\bar{a})$ increases since \bar{a} increases and $\eta(\theta)$ decreases.

When v_0 increases, the change of the veto probability $\tilde{p}(\theta)$ is uncertain. We illustrate this using a numeric example in Appendix A4.

Next we derive comparative statics concerning the value of the status quo option for the principal.

Proposition 3. *Among all valuable optimal veto mechanisms, if the value of status quo alternative for the principal u_0 is higher, then*

- (a) separating actions $\eta(\theta)$ increase for each possible θ ,
- (b) cutoffs \bar{a} and $\bar{\theta}$ both decrease, and
- (c) veto probabilities $\tilde{p}^*(\theta)$ weakly increase for all $\theta \in [0, 1]$.

Proof. See Appendix A5. □




Figure 4: Changes of $\tilde{a}^*(\theta)$ and $\tilde{p}^*(\theta)$ when u_0 increases to u'_0

Figure 4 illustrates Proposition 3 graphically. The intuition for the proposition is as follows. First, note that to keep the indifference constraints (\mathcal{I}), the principal can either strategically exercise his veto power (i.e., choosing a suitable $\tilde{p}(\theta)$) or adjust the action $\eta(\theta)$. Then when u_0 increases, the principal is more willing to maintain the

status quo and the veto probability increases (Proposition 3(c)). As a substitute, the principal increases the action $\eta(\theta)$ (Proposition 3(a)), which maintains the indifference constraints and increases the principal's payoffs as well. Finally, as the status quo option becomes more favorable, the principal is more willing to employ the lotteries and thus the cutoff $\bar{\theta}$ decreases. This effect, combined with the increasing $\eta(\theta)$, leads to the decrease of \bar{a} (Proposition 3(b)).

Finally, one might conjecture that among valuable optimal veto mechanisms, the state cutoff $\bar{\theta}$ changes monotonically when usual stochastic orderings (such as first-order stochastic dominance and likelihood ratios) are imposed on the prior beliefs. Nevertheless, this does not hold in our setting. In Appendix A6, we provide numeric examples demonstrating that when G_1 dominates G_2 in the sense of likelihood ratio, the state cutoff induced by G_1 can be either higher or lower than that induced by G_2 .

4 Extensions

We have assumed $v_0 \leq 0$ in the previous analysis. In this section, we show that a positive v_0 can alter the optimal veto mechanism dramatically. We also show that the optimality of veto mechanisms holds when allowing for a risk-averse agent.

4.1 $v_0 \geq 1$

Consider the case of $v_0 \geq 1$, and then the status quo option serves as a reward option rather than a punishment option. As Lemma 1 does not depend on the value of v_0 , we can still focus on the class of veto mechanisms and decompose the principal's maximization problem into two sequential maximization problems (\mathcal{M}_1) and (\mathcal{M}_2) as in the main model. The only difference is that now the agent prefers the status quo option and v_0 becomes the upper bound for the agent's equilibrium payoff, whereas in the previous analysis v_0 is the lower bound. The following proposition summarizes the optimal veto mechanism in this case.

Proposition 4. *Assume $v_0 \geq 1$.*

(a) *If $(v_0 - \mathbb{E}_G(\theta))^2 < v_0^2 + u_0$, define $\varphi(\theta) \equiv v_0 - \sqrt{(v_0 - \theta)^2 + u_0}$ for $\theta \leq v_0 - \sqrt{-u_0}$*

and the optimal veto mechanism $(\tilde{a}^*(\theta), \tilde{p}^*(\theta))$ is

$$\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \begin{cases} \varphi(\theta), & \text{if } \theta < \bar{\theta} \\ \bar{a}, & \text{if } \theta \geq \bar{\theta} \end{cases} \quad \tilde{p}^*(\theta) = \begin{cases} \frac{\bar{a} - \varphi(\theta)}{v_0 - \varphi(\theta)}, & \text{if } \theta < \bar{\theta} \\ 0, & \text{if } \theta \geq \bar{\theta} \end{cases}$$

where $\bar{\theta} = \varphi^{-1}(\bar{a})$ and \bar{a} is determined by $\int_0^{\varphi^{-1}(\bar{a})} (\varphi(\theta) - \bar{a}) dG(\theta) + \bar{a} - \mathbb{E}_G(\theta) = 0$. Moreover, $\bar{a} \in (\mathbb{E}_G(\theta), 1)$.

(b) If $(v_0 - \mathbb{E}_G(\theta))^2 \geq v_0^2 + u_0$, then the optimal veto mechanism is $\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$ and $\tilde{p}^*(\theta) = 0$; that is, the principal chooses the action $\mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$ regardless of the state.

Proof. See Appendix A7. □




Figure 5: Optimal veto mechanism when $v_0 \geq 1$

Figure 5 illustrates the valuable optimal veto mechanism when $v_0 \geq 1$: the principal uses veto only when the state is below the threshold $\bar{\theta}$, and those corresponding actions $\tilde{a}^*(\theta)$ are higher than θ . Also, as opposed to the case of $v_0 \leq 0$, there exists no valuable veto mechanism when $\mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$ is sufficiently low (i.e., when players' preferences are sufficiently misaligned ex ante).

4.2 $v_0 \in (0, 1)$

When $v_0 \in (0, 1)$, the optimal veto mechanism is sensitive to the shape of the belief distribution $G(\cdot)$, and solving for the optimal mechanism in general is more complicated. For discussions, we characterize the optimal veto mechanism in two specialized settings, which differentiate greatly from the ones identified in Propositions 1 and 4.

4.2.1 U-shaped $\tilde{a}^*(\theta)$ and $\tilde{p}^*(\theta)$

Let $v_0 = 0.38$, $u_0 = -0.1$ and the prior belief be the uniform distribution over Θ . The optimal action function $\tilde{a}^*(\theta)$ and the optimal veto rule $\tilde{p}^*(\theta)$ are U-shaped:

$$\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \begin{cases} \eta(\theta) & \text{if } \theta \in [0, \underline{\theta});^9 \\ \bar{a} & \text{if } \theta \in [\underline{\theta}, \bar{\theta}); \\ \eta(\theta) & \text{if } \theta \in [\bar{\theta}, 1], \end{cases} \quad \tilde{p}^*(\theta) = \begin{cases} \frac{\eta(\theta) - \bar{a}}{\eta(\theta) - v_0} & \text{if } \theta \in [0, \underline{\theta}); \\ 0 & \text{if } \theta \in [\underline{\theta}, \bar{\theta}); \\ \frac{\eta(\theta) - \bar{a}}{\eta(\theta) - v_0} & \text{if } \theta \in [\bar{\theta}, 1], \end{cases}$$

where the approximate values are given by $\underline{\theta} \approx 0.063$, $\bar{\theta} \approx 0.697$ and $\bar{a} \approx 0.397$. To obtain this result, we first divide the problem into two categories, $\hat{v} \geq v_0$ and $\hat{v} \leq v_0$, where \hat{v} is the agent's expected payoff. For each case, we employ the two-step method to solve (\mathcal{M}_1) and (\mathcal{M}_2) sequentially. We find that it's optimal for the principal to set $\hat{v} \geq v_0$, and thus the status quo option serves as a stick rather than a carrot. Detailed derivations are relegated to Appendix A8.1.

Figure 6 illustrates the optimal veto mechanism: both $\tilde{a}^*(\theta)$ and $\tilde{p}^*(\theta)$ are U-shaped and the principal uses veto at both the higher and the lower states. Note that when $\theta < \underline{\theta}$, the principal's payoffs from those actions $\tilde{a}^*(\theta)$ are lower than that from the pooling action \bar{a} , yet the principal finds it optimal to take these higher actions. The reason for this phenomenon is as follows. When $\theta \in [0, \underline{\theta}]$, principal's payoff from the pooling action \bar{a} is lower than u_0 . It follows that the principal has incentives to put more probability weight on the status quo option. As a result, the principal must also set $\tilde{a}(\theta)$ higher than \bar{a} to maintain the indifference constraints (\mathcal{I}) .

⁹Substituting the values of v_0 and u_0 into the expression of $\eta(\theta)$ as defined in Proposition 1 yields $\eta(\theta) = \sqrt{(\theta - 0.38)^2 - 0.1} + 0.38$ in this case.




Figure 6: U-shaped $\tilde{a}^*(\theta)$ and $\tilde{p}^*(\theta)$

4.2.2 Optimal veto mechanism can be deterministic

Let $v_0 = \frac{1}{2}$, $u_0 > -\frac{1}{4}$ and the prior belief be the uniform distribution over Θ . In this case, the optimal veto mechanism is deterministic. Using the language of veto delegation, the principal approves if the proposed option is $a = v_0$ and otherwise vetoes. In the equilibrium, the agent proposes $a = v_0$ when the state lies in the intermediate interval and otherwise proposes some other option $a' \neq v_0$. Figure 7 illustrates the deterministic solution in this case. To derive this result, we employ the same procedures as laid out in Section 4.2.1 and find that the agent's expected payoff is set at v_0 in the solution. Detailed derivations are relegated to Appendix A8.2.

4.3 Risk-averse agent

It remains to be answered whether the optimality of the veto mechanism (Lemma 1) holds when the agent is risk-averse. We show that this result holds when the agent has an LQ-form utility function as in Kartik et al. (2021):

$$v(a) = -(1-\gamma)(1-a) - \gamma(1-a)^2 \text{ for some } \gamma \in [0, 1].^{10}$$

¹⁰The exact expression of the LQ condition in Kartik et al. (2021) is $-(1-\gamma)|1-a| - \gamma(1-a)^2$, and we do not take the absolute value of $(1-a)$ here. This is without loss of generality as the principal has no incentives to delegate actions that are higher than 1. This modification makes our setting more




Figure 7: The deterministic case

The LQ-form utility is a convex combination of the linear and the quadratic loss functions, and thus the agent is risk averse when $\gamma \neq 0$. We formally present this generalized result in Proposition 5.

Proposition 5. *Suppose the agent has an LQ-form utility function. For any incentive-compatible mechanism α , there exists a veto mechanism α' that yields a weakly higher expected utility for the principal.*

Proof. See Appendix A9. □

The proof is almost the same as that of Lemma 1. Denote by \hat{F}_θ the CDF of the action distribution at state θ . Let F_θ be the restriction of \hat{F}_θ to $(-\infty, M]$. We show that in the solution F_θ is degenerate for each $\theta \in \Theta$. The intuition of Proposition 5 is as follows. Given the utility form of the principal and the agent, both players only care about the first- and second-order moments of the distribution F_θ . For the principal, the marginal rate of substitution (MRS) between the second-order origin moment and the first-order origin moment is -2θ , which is always higher than that of the agent, $(-\frac{1}{\gamma} - 1)$. The indifference constraints (\mathcal{I}) allow the principal to “trade” the first-order origin moment for the second-order origin moment at the rate of the agent’s MRS.

consistent as the agent’s utility function in the main model specializes to the case of $\gamma = 0$.

Therefore, the principal is always willing to decrease the second-order origin moment at the expense of decreasing the first-order origin moment. In the solution, the second-order origin moment of F_θ is zero and thus F_θ is degenerate.

Non-optimality of veto mechanisms The optimality of veto mechanisms relies on the implicit assumption that the principal is more risk averse than the agent. As a counter-example, suppose the principal has absolute loss payoff: $u = -|a - \theta|$, and the agent has quadratic loss payoff $v = -(1 - a)^2$ for $a \leq 1$. Then the principal can achieve an outcome arbitrarily close to the first-best outcome without using veto: for arbitrarily small $\epsilon > 0$, given the reported state $\hat{\theta}$ the principal chooses a lottery of actions with expectation being $\theta - \epsilon$, its support lying in $(-\infty, \theta]$ and the appropriate variance such that constraints (\mathcal{I}) hold.¹¹

5 Application to legislative rules

Our model can be applied to gain new insights in the design of the legislative rules. Most previous works on legislative rules, such as Gilligan and Krehbiel (1987,1989) and Krishna and Morgan (2001), take the rules as given and study the informational efficiency of the *closed rule* and the *open rule*. Alonso and Matouschek (2008) adopt the mechanism design approach, but their identified optimal legislative rule takes the interval delegation form, which is different from both the closed rule and the open rule. Our framework supports the superiority of the closed rule, given that the principal can pre-commit to the veto probabilities conditional on the agent's proposals.

Model The committee (Agent) makes a proposal to the legislature (Principal) regarding which policy to adopt. The legislature's utility is determined by both the state $\theta \in [0, 1]$ and the enacted policy $a \in (-\infty, 2] \cup \{a_0\}$, where a_0 means maintaining the status quo. The committee's utility function $v(a)$ and the legislature's utility functions $u(a, \theta)$ are

¹¹This almost first-best outcome is essentially the same with the example of non-optimality of deterministic allocations in Kováč and Mylovanov (2009, Section 4). See also Example E.1 in Kartik et al. (2021) for an illustration of the non-optimality of deterministic mechanisms.

given by:

$$v(a) = \begin{cases} a & \text{if } a \in (-\infty, 2]; \\ 0 & \text{if } a = a_0, \end{cases} \quad u(a, \theta) = \begin{cases} -(a - \theta)^2 & \text{if } a \in (-\infty, 2]; \\ -0.2 & \text{if } a = a_0. \end{cases}$$

Note that the committee is extremely biased and prefers higher policies regardless of the state.

The committee privately observes the state θ . The legislature does not know the state and his prior belief is that θ is uniformly distributed. The legislature can commit to any (stochastic) decision rule. These rules include (i) the open rule under which the legislature is free to enact any new policy or maintain the status quo and (ii) the closed rule under which the legislature either accepts a proposal or rejects for the status quo policy.

Optimal legislative rule Previous analysis indicates that it is without loss to focus on veto mechanisms, and the optimal veto mechanism is achieved by the veto delegation arrangement. In particular, an optimal legislative rule is as follows: the legislature commits to always approving any proposal from $[0, 0.394]$; ¹² approving the proposal $a \in (0.394, \sqrt{0.8}]$ with probability $\frac{0.394}{a}$ and using veto with the complementary probability; otherwise always using veto. As a result, this optimal legislative rule corresponds to the closed rule.

6 Concluding remarks

In this paper, we study the optimal delegation problem when the informed agent has state-independent preferences. We show that it is without loss of generality to restrict attention to the class of veto mechanisms. Then we characterize the principal's optimal veto mechanism and discuss its properties. While we assume a risk-neutral agent in the main model, the optimality of veto mechanisms holds when we relax this assumption. We also provide comparative statics and discuss some variants of the main model.

¹²Here 0.394 is an approximate solution to $\int_{\sqrt{a^2+0.2}}^1 (\sqrt{\theta^2-0.2}-a) d\theta + a - \frac{1}{2} = 0$.

In deriving the optimality of veto mechanisms, we have assumed that the status quo option a_0 yields constant payoffs for both players—especially for the principal—regardless of the state. This assumption is necessary for the existence of valuable veto mechanisms in our setting, and we argue that it fits naturally in many real-life scenarios. For an illustration, consider that a customer “delegates” her purchasing decision to a salesperson, and then the salesperson recommends some product to the customer. The state of nature measures the degree to which the product matches the customer’s needs, and the customer is uncertain about the state. As the value of the alternative use of money for the customer does not depend on how well the recommended product suits her, the payoff from rejecting the salesperson’s recommendation is state-independent. Furthermore, in the literature of contract theory, it’s also usually assumed that the value of outside option from not signing the contract is state-independent for the principal. For example, in an investor-entrepreneur relationship, the participation constraint requires that the expected return to the investor (principal) must cover the opportunity cost of funds, and the opportunity cost is usually measured by a constant interest rate (e.g., Gale and Hellwig, 2003).

Admittedly, the assumption that payoff from the status quo option is state-independent may seem unnatural in other scenarios and demands further justifications. For instance, in our motivating example, when the policy maker rejects a new proposal, the status quo policy may not be a safe option yielding constant payoffs for him. We resort to behavioral/psychological justifications for these cases. It is well-documented in the behavioral economics literature that individuals possess qualitatively different perceptions between choosing the status quo action and choosing other actions (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979); furthermore, individuals also tend to feel more responsible when enacting new options (Bartling and Fischbacher, 2012). In our motivating example, the policy maker may be (or feel) more responsible for the actual effects of a new policy, and may be (or feel) less responsible for maintaining the status quo option. Therefore, the policy maker can be insensitive to the result of an inaction, and maintaining the status quo yields a constant payoff for him regardless of the state.

References

- Aghion, P., and J. Tirole (1997), “Formal and real authority in organizations,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 105(1), 1–29.
- Alonso, R., and N. Matouschek (2008), “Optimal delegation,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 75(1), 259–293.
- Amador, M., and K. Bagwell (2013), “The theory of optimal delegation with an application to tariff caps,” *Econometrica*, 81(4), 1541–1599.
- Baron, D.P., and R.B. Myerson (1982), “Regulating a monopolist with unknown costs,” *Econometrica*, 50(4), 911–930.
- Bartling, B., and Fischbacher, U. (2012). “Shifting the blame: On delegation and responsibility.” *Review of Economic Studies*, 79(1), 67–87.
- Bendor, J., A. Glazer, and T. Hammond (2001), “Theories of delegation,” *Annual Review of Political Science*, 4(1), 235–269.
- Chakraborty, A., and R. Harbaugh (2010), “Persuasion by cheap talk,” *American Economic Review*, 100(5), 2361–82.
- Dessein, W. (2002), “Authority and communication in organizations,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 69(4), 811–838.
- Diehl, C., and C. Kuzmics (2021), “The (non-)robustness of influential cheap talk equilibria when the sender’s preferences are state independent,” *International Journal of Game Theory*, 1–15.
- Doran, M. (2010), “The closed rule,” *Emory Law Journal*, 59, 1363.
- Gale, D., and M. Hellwig (1985), “Incentive-compatible debt contracts: The one-period problem,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 52(4), 647–663.
- Gilligan, T. W., and K. Krehbiel (1987), “Collective decision-making and standing committees: An informational rationale for restrictive amendment procedures,” *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*, 3(2), 287–335.
- (1989), “Asymmetric information and legislative rules with a heterogeneous committee,” *American Journal of Political Science*, 33(2), 459–490.
- Glazer, J., and A. Rubinstein (2004), “On optimal rules of persuasion,” *Econometrica*, 72(6), 1715–1736.

— (2006), “A study in the pragmatics of persuasion: A game theoretical approach,” *Theoretical Economics*, 1, 395–410.

Hart, S., I. Kremer, and M. Perry (2017), “Evidence games: Truth and commitment,” *American Economic Review*, 107(3), 690–713.

Holmstrom, B. (1980), “On the theory of delegation,” Discussion Papers. <https://ideas.repec.org/p/nwu/>

Kahneman, D., and A. Tversky (1979), “Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk,” *Econometrica*, 47(2), 263–292.

Kamenica, E., and M. Gentzkow (2011), “Bayesian persuasion,” *American Economic Review*, 101(6), 2590–2615.

Kartik, N., A. Kleiner, and R. Van Weelden (2021), “Delegation in veto bargaining,” *American Economic Review*, 111(12), 4046–87.

Kolotilin, A., and A. Zapechelnuk (2019), “Persuasion meets delegation,” Unpublished. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1902.02628>.

Kováč, E., and T. Mylovanov (2009), “Stochastic mechanisms in settings without monetary transfers: The regular case,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 144(4), 1373–1395.

Krishna, V., and J. Morgan (2001), “Asymmetric information and legislative rules: Some amendments,” *American Political Science Review*, 95(2), 435–452.

Lipnowski, E., and D. Ravid (2020), “Cheap talk with transparent motives,” *Econometrica*, 88(4), 1631–1660.

Lubensky, D., and E. Schmidbauer (2018), “Equilibrium informativeness in veto games,” *Games and Economic Behavior*, 109, 104–125.

Marino, A.M. (2007), “Delegation versus veto in organizational games of strategic communication,” *Journal of Public Economic Theory*, 9(6), 979–992.

Martimort, D., and A. Semenov (2006), “Continuity in mechanism design without transfers,” *Economics Letters*, 93(2), 182–189.

Melumad, N.D., and T. Shibano (1991), “Communication in settings with no transfers,” *RAND Journal of Economics*, 173–198.

Mylovanov, T. (2008), “Veto-based delegation,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 138(1), 297–307.

Appendix

A1 Proof of Lemma 1

Proof. Each CDF $F_\theta \in M_0(A)$ can be expressed as a convex combination of H_{a_0} and a CDF \hat{F}_θ whose support lies in $(-\infty, M]$: $F_\theta = \tilde{p}(\theta)H_{a_0} + (1 - \tilde{p}(\theta))\hat{F}_\theta$ where $\tilde{p}(\theta)$ is the probability mass that F_θ puts on a_0 . Given that expression, the principal's maximization problem (\mathcal{M}) could be equivalently stated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\{\hat{F}_\theta\}_{\theta \in \Theta, \hat{v}}} \int_0^1 \left(\tilde{p}(\theta)u_0 - (1 - \tilde{p}(\theta)) \int_{-\infty}^M (a - \theta)^2 d\hat{F}_\theta(a) \right) g(\theta) d\theta \\ & \text{subject to (i) } \tilde{p}(\theta)v_0 + (1 - \tilde{p}(\theta)) \int_{-\infty}^M a d\hat{F}_\theta(a) = \hat{v}, \\ & \quad \text{(ii) } \hat{F}_\theta \text{ is a CDF with support in } (-\infty, M], \forall \theta \in [0, 1]. \end{aligned}$$

Fixing \hat{v} and $\tilde{p}(\theta)$, we show that the principal obtains the highest payoff only if $\hat{F}_\theta(a)$ is degenerate. To show that, we solve the following state-wise maximization problem for each state θ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\hat{F}_\theta} \int_{-\infty}^M -(a - \theta)^2 d\hat{F}_\theta(a) \\ & \text{subject to (i) } \int_A a d\hat{F}_\theta(a) = \frac{\hat{v} - \tilde{p}(\theta)v_0}{1 - \tilde{p}(\theta)} \equiv v_\theta \quad (3) \\ & \quad \text{(ii) } \hat{F}_\theta \text{ is a CDF with support in } (-\infty, M]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mu_\theta \equiv \int_{-\infty}^M a d\hat{F}_\theta$ and $\sigma_\theta \equiv \int_{-\infty}^M (a - \mu_\theta)^2 d\hat{F}_\theta$. The principal's state-wise optimization problem (3) reduces to

$$\min_{\mu_\theta, \sigma_\theta \geq 0} \sigma_\theta - 2\theta\mu_\theta + (\mu_\theta)^2 \quad \text{subject to } \mu_\theta = v_\theta.$$

In the solution, the equality $\sigma_\theta = 0$ holds regardless of the state θ . Therefore, the principal obtains highest possible payoffs only when $F_\theta(a)$ is a degenerate distribution.

□

A2 Proof of Proposition 1

Denote by \hat{v} the agent's payoff at each state. We first fix some $\hat{v} \geq v_0$ and consider the principal's optimization problem at state $\theta \in \Theta$.

Step 1: State-wise optimization

Constraints (I) imply

$$\tilde{p}(\theta) = \frac{\tilde{a}(\theta) - \hat{v}}{\tilde{a}(\theta) - v_0}. \quad (4)$$

Equation (4) implies that $\tilde{p}(\theta) \leq 1$ is equivalent to $\hat{v} \geq v_0$ and that $\tilde{p}(\theta) \geq 0$ is equivalent to $\hat{v} \leq \tilde{a}(\theta)$. Substitute equation (4) into the principal's utility function, and the optimization problem (\mathcal{M}_1) yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\tilde{a}(\theta) \in (-\infty, M]} & \left(\frac{\tilde{a}(\theta) - \hat{v}}{\tilde{a}(\theta) - v_0} \right) u_0 - \left(\frac{\hat{v} - v_0}{\tilde{a}(\theta) - v_0} \right) (\tilde{a}(\theta) - \theta)^2 \\ & \text{subject to } \tilde{a}(\theta) \geq \hat{v}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The solution to problem (5) is

$$\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \begin{cases} \max\{\hat{v}, \eta(\theta)\} & \text{if } (\theta - v_0)^2 + u_0 \geq 0 \\ \hat{v} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where $\eta(\theta) = \sqrt{(\theta - v_0)^2 + u_0} + v_0$.

Step 2: Optimal \hat{v} .

Based on equation (6), we derive the optimal \hat{v} for different values of u_0 and v_0 in the following cases:

- I. $u_0 + v_0^2 \geq 0$. In this case, $u_0 + (\theta - v_0)^2 \geq 0$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$.
- II. $u_0 + v_0^2 < 0$ and $u_0 + (1 - v_0)^2 > 0$. In this case, $u_0 + (\theta - v_0)^2 < 0$ for $\theta \in [0, \sqrt{-u_0} + v_0)$ and $u_0 + (\theta - v_0)^2 \geq 0$ for $\theta \in [\sqrt{-u_0} + v_0, 1]$.

III. $u_0 + (1 - v_0)^2 \leq 0$. In this case, $u_0 + (\theta - v_0)^2 \leq 0$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$.

Case I: $u_0 + v_0^2 \geq 0$ We first explicitly write out the principal's optimal action $\tilde{a}^*(\theta)$ specified by Equation (6) for different ranges of \hat{v} (Figure 8), and then find the optimal \hat{v} within each range. Finally, we compare the solutions in different ranges and find the global maximum.




Figure 8: principal's $\tilde{a}^*(\theta)$ for different \hat{v} when $u_0 + v_0^2 \geq 0$

1. When $\hat{v} \in [v_0, \eta(0)]$, the principal's optimal action is

$$\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \eta(\theta);$$

and the probability mass put on a_0 is

$$\tilde{p}^*(\theta) = \frac{\eta(\theta) - \hat{v}}{\eta(\theta) - v_0}.$$

The principal's optimization problem is reduced to

$$\max_{\hat{v} \geq 0} \int_0^1 \left(\frac{\eta(\theta) - \hat{v}}{\eta(\theta) - v_0} \right) u_0 - \left(\frac{\hat{v} - v_0}{\eta(\theta) - v_0} \right) (\eta(\theta) - \theta)^2 dG(\theta) \equiv \max_{\hat{v} \geq 0} \Gamma_1(\hat{v})$$

The FOC yields

$$\Gamma_1'(\hat{v}) = 2 \int_0^1 (\theta - v_0) - \sqrt{(\theta - v_0)^2 + u_0} dG(\theta) > 0$$

for all $\hat{v} \in [v_0, \eta(0)]$. Hence $\Gamma_1(\hat{v})$ attains its maximum at $\hat{v}^* = \eta(0)$.

2. When $\hat{v} \in [\eta(0), \eta(1)]$, the principal's optimal action is

$$\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \begin{cases} \hat{v}, & \text{if } \theta \leq \eta^{-1}(\hat{v}) \\ \eta(\theta), & \text{if } \theta > \eta^{-1}(\hat{v}) \end{cases}$$

and the probability mass put on a_0 is

$$\tilde{p}^*(\theta) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \theta \leq \eta^{-1}(\hat{v}) \\ \frac{\eta(\theta) - \hat{v}}{\eta(\theta) - v_0}, & \text{if } \theta > \eta^{-1}(\hat{v}) \end{cases}$$

The principal's maximization problem is reduced to

$$\max_{\hat{v}} \Gamma_2(\hat{v}) \equiv \int_0^{\eta^{-1}(\hat{v})} -(\hat{v} - \theta)^2 dG(\theta) + \int_{\eta^{-1}(\hat{v})}^1 \left[\left(\frac{\eta(\theta) - \hat{v}}{\eta(\theta) - v_0} \right) u_0 - \left(\frac{\hat{v} - v_0}{\eta(\theta) - v_0} \right) (\eta(\theta) - \theta)^2 \right] dG(\theta)$$

The FOC yields

$$\Gamma_2'(\hat{v}) = -2 \left(\int_{\eta^{-1}(\hat{v})}^1 \eta(\theta) - \hat{v} dG(\theta) + \hat{v} - \mathbb{E}_G(\theta) \right) \quad (7)$$

To find the sign of $\Gamma_2'(\hat{v})$, first note that $\Gamma_2'(\hat{v})$ is decreasing: $\Gamma_2''(\hat{v}) = -2 \int_0^{\eta^{-1}(\hat{v})} 1 dG(\theta) < 0$. At the two end points $\eta(0)$ and $\eta(1)$,

$$\Gamma_2'(\eta(0)) = -2 \int_0^1 \eta(\theta) - \theta dG(\theta) > 0;$$

$$\Gamma_2'(\eta(1)) = -2(\eta(1) - \mathbb{E}_G(\theta)).$$

- (a) If $\eta(1) \leq \mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$ then $\Gamma'_2(\eta(1)) \geq 0$. And the solution is $\hat{v}^* = \eta(1)$.
(b) If $\eta(1) > \mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$, then $\Gamma'_2(\eta(1)) < 0$, And the solution is $\hat{v}^* = \bar{v}$ where \bar{v} is given by $\Gamma'_2(\bar{v}) = 0$.

We could further show that $\bar{v} \in (0, \mathbb{E}_G(\theta))$:

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma'_2(0) &= -2 \left(\int_{\eta^{-1}(0)}^1 \eta(\theta) dG(\theta) - \mathbb{E}_G(\theta) \right) \\ &= 2 \left(\int_{\eta^{-1}(0)}^1 \theta - \eta(\theta) dG(\theta) + \int_0^{\eta^{-1}(0)} \theta dG(\theta) \right) > 0; \\ \Gamma'_2(\mathbb{E}_G(\theta)) &= -2 \left(\int_{\eta^{-1}(\mathbb{E}_G(\theta))}^1 \eta(\theta) - \mathbb{E}_G(\theta) dG(\theta) \right) < 0.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\Gamma''_2(\hat{v}) < 0$, it follows that $\bar{v} \in (0, \mathbb{E}_G(\theta))$.

3. When $\hat{v} \in [\eta(1), 1]$, the principal's optimal action is $\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \hat{v}$ and the probability mass that is put on a_0 is $\tilde{p}^*(\theta) = 0$.

The principal's optimization problem is reduced to

$$\max_{\hat{v}} - \int_0^1 (\hat{v} - \theta)^2 dG(\theta) \equiv \max_{\hat{v}} \Gamma_3(\hat{v})$$

The FOC yields

$$\Gamma'_3(\hat{v}) = -2(\hat{v} - \mathbb{E}_G(\theta))$$

Furthermore, $\Gamma''_3(\hat{v}) = -2 < 0$. At the two end points,

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma'_3(1) &= -2(1 - \mathbb{E}_G(\theta)) < 0 \\ \Gamma'_3(\eta(1)) &= -2(\eta(1) - \mathbb{E}_G(\theta))\end{aligned}$$

- (a) If $\eta(1) \leq \mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$, then $\Gamma'_3(\eta(1)) \geq 0$. And the solution is $\hat{v}^* = \mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$.
(b) If $\eta(1) > \mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$, then $\Gamma'_3(\eta(1)) < 0$. And the solution is $\hat{v}^* = \eta(1)$.

To conclude,

1. If $\eta(1) \leq \mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$, \hat{v}^* within the three ranges are

$$\hat{v}^* = \begin{cases} \eta(0) & \text{if } \hat{v} \in [v_0, \eta(0)] \\ \eta(1) & \text{if } \hat{v} \in [\eta(0), \eta(1)] \\ \mathbb{E}_G(\theta) & \text{if } \hat{v} \in [\eta(1), 1] \end{cases}$$

2. If $\eta(1) > \mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$, \hat{v}^* within the three ranges are

$$\hat{v}^* = \begin{cases} \eta(0) & \text{if } \hat{v} \in [v_0, \eta(0)] \\ \bar{v} & \text{if } \hat{v} \in [\eta(0), \eta(1)] \\ \eta(1) & \text{if } \hat{v} \in [\eta(1), 1] \end{cases}$$

where \bar{v} is the solution to $\Gamma_2'(\bar{v}) = 0$ (equation (7)).

Since the ranges overlap at the corner, we directly compare the solutions in the three ranges. The global solution is as follows:

1. If $\eta(1) \leq \mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$, $\hat{v}^* = \mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$. And the action is pooled at $\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$.
2. If $\eta(1) > \mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$, $\hat{v}^* = \bar{v}$ where \bar{v} is given by $\Gamma_2'(\bar{v}) = 0$ (equation (7)). And the corresponding action function is as follows:
 - when $\theta \in [0, \eta^{-1}(\bar{v})]$, the action is pooled at $\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \bar{v}$, and
 - when $\theta \in (\eta^{-1}(\bar{v}), 1]$, the default action a_0 is chosen with probability $\frac{\eta(\theta) - \bar{v}}{\eta(\theta) - v_0}$ and the action $\eta(\theta)$ is chosen with the complementary probability.

Case II: $u_0 + v_0^2 < 0$ and $u_0 + (1 - v_0)^2 > 0$ The analysis of this case is very similar to that of Case I, except that there are only two cases to consider: $\hat{v} \in [v_0, \eta(1)]$ and $\hat{v} \in [\eta(1), 1]$. See Figure 9. The global solution is the same as that of Case I.

Since the solution of Case I and Case II are the same, the two cases are combined and the corresponding condition becomes $u_0 + (1 - v_0)^2 > 0$. Furthermore, the condition for pooling action $\eta(1) \leq \mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$ is equivalent to $u_0 + (1 - v_0)^2 \leq (\mathbb{E}_G(\theta) - v_0)^2$. Therefore,

- When $0 < u_0 + (1 - v_0)^2 \leq (\mathbb{E}_G(\theta) - v_0)^2$, the action is pooled at $\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$;




Figure 9: principal's $\tilde{a}^*(\theta)$ for different \hat{v} when $u_0 + v_0^2 < 0$ and $u_0 + (1 - v_0)^2 < 0$

- When $u_0 + (1 - v_0)^2 > (\mathbb{E}_G(\theta) - v_0)^2$, the optimal action rule is the same as equations (2) in Proposition 1.

Case III: $u_0 + (1 - v_0)^2 \leq 0$ The principal's optimal action function is

$$\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \hat{v} \text{ for all } \theta \in [0, 1],$$

and the probability mass that is put on a_0 is $\tilde{p}^*(\theta) = 0$.

The principal's maximization problem is reduced to

$$\max_{\hat{v}} - \int_0^1 (\hat{v} - \theta)^2 dG(\theta)$$

The FOC yields

$$- \int_0^1 2(\hat{v} - \theta) dG(\theta) = 0 \implies \hat{v}^* = \mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$$

Therefore, the action is pooled at $\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$.

Proposition 1 summarizes the result. In particular, the case $(\mathbb{E}_G(\theta) - v_0)^2 < u_0 + (1 - v_0)^2$ corresponds to part (a) of the proposition; the cases $0 < u_0 + (1 - v_0)^2 \leq (\mathbb{E}_G(\theta) - v_0)^2$ and $u_0 + (1 - v_0)^2 \leq 0$ both result in pooled action and are combined,

forming part (b) of the proposition. For expositional purpose, we use \bar{a} to denote \bar{v} in the proposition.

A3 Proof of Corollary 1

We focus on the valuable optimal veto mechanisms.

1. When $\theta \in [0, \eta^{-1}(\bar{a})]$, $\tilde{a}(\theta) = \bar{a}$ and $\tilde{p}(\theta) = 0$.
2. When $\theta \in (\eta^{-1}(\bar{a}), 1]$, $\tilde{a}(\theta) = \eta(\theta) = \sqrt{(\theta - v_0)^2 + u_0} + v_0$. Taking derivative of $\eta(\theta)$ with respect to θ gives

$$\eta'(\theta) = \frac{\theta - v_0}{\sqrt{(\theta - v_0)^2 + u_0}} > 0.$$

$\tilde{p}(\theta) = \frac{\eta(\theta) - \bar{a}}{\eta(\theta) - v_0}$. Taking derivative of $\tilde{p}(\theta)$ with respect to θ gives

$$p'(\theta) = \frac{\eta'(\theta)(\eta(\theta) - v_0) - \eta'(\theta)(\eta(\theta) - \bar{a})}{(\eta(\theta) - v_0)^2} = \frac{\eta'(\theta)(\bar{a} - v_0)}{(\eta(\theta) - v_0)^2} > 0.$$

Therefore, $\tilde{a}(\theta)$ and $\tilde{p}(\theta)$ are constant over $\theta \in [0, \eta^{-1}(\bar{a})]$ and strictly increase over $\theta \in (\eta^{-1}(\bar{a}), 1]$.

As for part (b), fix some $\theta \in (\eta^{-1}(\bar{a}), 1]$. Since $u_0 < 0$, we have $\sqrt{(\theta - v_0)^2 + u_0} < \theta - v_0$. Therefore, $\eta(\theta) = \sqrt{(\theta - v_0)^2 + u_0} + v_0 < \theta$.

A4 Proof of Proposition 2 and a numeric example

Recall $\eta(\theta) = \sqrt{u_0 + (\theta - v_0)^2} + v_0$. Partial derivative of $\eta(\theta)$ with respect to v_0 gives

$$\frac{\partial \eta(\theta)}{\partial v_0} = - \left(\frac{\theta - v_0}{\sqrt{(\theta - v_0)^2 + u_0}} - 1 \right) < 0 \text{ for all } \theta \in [0, 1].$$

Therefore, $\eta(\theta)$ decreases with v_0 for all $\theta \in [0, 1]$.

For \bar{a} , recall that it is obtained by the FOC, letting Γ'_2 in Equation (7) equal to 0:

$$\int_{\eta^{-1}(\bar{a})}^1 \eta(\theta) - \bar{a} \, dG(\theta) + \bar{a} - \mathbb{E}(\theta) = 0.$$

Taking partial derivative with respect to v_0 yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial \eta^{-1}(\bar{a})}{\partial v_0} (\eta(\hat{\theta}) - \bar{a}) g(\hat{\theta}) + \int_{\eta^{-1}(\bar{a})}^1 \frac{\partial \eta(\theta)}{\partial v_0} - \frac{\partial \bar{a}}{\partial v_0} \, dG(\theta) + \frac{\partial \bar{a}}{\partial v_0} = 0 \\ \implies & \int_{\eta^{-1}(\bar{a})}^1 \frac{\partial \eta(\theta)}{\partial v_0} \, dG(\theta) + \int_0^{\eta^{-1}(\bar{a})} \frac{\partial \bar{a}}{\partial v_0} \, dG(\theta) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

As we have established that $\frac{\partial \eta(\theta)}{\partial v_0} < 0$ for all $\theta \in [0, 1]$, $\frac{\partial \bar{a}}{\partial v_0} > 0$ follows. \square

Lastly, we illustrate that the changes of $\tilde{p}(\theta)$ with respect to v_0 may not be uniform. Fix the PDF $g(\theta) = 1$ for each θ and $u_0 = -0.2$. Consider the veto probabilities when v_0 changes from -0.5 to -0.3 . It follows that $\tilde{p}(1)$ increases from around 0.42 to around 0.47 while the threshold $\bar{\theta}$ increases from around 0.44 to 0.49. Therefore, the changes of $\tilde{p}(\theta)$ are uncertain, which is illustrated in Figure 10.




Figure 10: Changes of \tilde{p}^* with respect to v_0 are not uniform

A5 Proof of Proposition 3

Recall $\eta(\theta) = \sqrt{u_0 + (\theta - v_0)^2} + v_0$. Partial derivative of $\eta(\theta)$ with respect to u_0 gives

$$\frac{\partial \eta(\theta)}{\partial u_0} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{u_0 + (\theta - v_0)^2}} > 0 \text{ for all } \theta \in [0, 1].$$

Therefore, $\eta(\theta)$ increases with u_0 for all $\theta \in [0, 1]$.

For \bar{a} , recall that \bar{a} is obtained by:

$$\int_{\eta^{-1}(\bar{a})}^1 \eta(\theta) - \bar{a} \, dG(\theta) + \bar{a} - \mathbb{E}(\theta) = 0.$$

Taking partial derivative with respect to u_0 gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial \eta^{-1}(\bar{a})}{\partial u_0} (\eta(\hat{\theta}) - \bar{a}) g(\hat{\theta}) + \int_{\eta^{-1}(\bar{a})}^1 \frac{\partial \eta(\theta)}{\partial u_0} - \frac{\partial \bar{a}}{\partial u_0} \, dG(\theta) + \frac{\partial \bar{a}}{\partial u_0} = 0 \\ \implies & \int_{\eta^{-1}(\bar{a})}^1 \frac{\partial \eta(\theta)}{\partial u_0} \, dG(\theta) + \int_0^{\eta^{-1}(\bar{a})} \frac{\partial \bar{a}}{\partial u_0} \, dG(\theta) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Since $\frac{\partial \eta(\theta)}{\partial u_0} > 0$ for all $\theta \in [0, 1]$, we obtain $\frac{\partial \bar{a}}{\partial u_0} < 0$.

For $\tilde{p}(\theta)$, recall $\tilde{p}(\theta) = 1 - \frac{\bar{a} - v_0}{\eta(\theta) - v_0}$. Taking derivative with respect to u_0 gives

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{p}(\theta)}{\partial u_0} = - \left(\frac{\frac{\partial \bar{a}}{\partial u_0} (\eta(\theta) - v_0) - (\bar{a} - v_0) \frac{\partial \eta(\theta)}{\partial u_0}}{(\eta(\theta) - v_0)^2} \right).$$

Since $\frac{\partial \bar{a}}{\partial u_0} < 0$, $\eta(\theta) - v_0 > 0$, $\bar{a} - v_0 > 0$ and $\frac{\partial \eta(\theta)}{\partial u_0} > 0$, then $\frac{\partial \tilde{p}(\theta)}{\partial u_0} > 0$ holds.

A6 Insufficiency of the likelihood ratio conditions

We use numeric examples to illustrate that a higher likelihood ratio cannot guarantee either a higher or a lower \bar{a} . First, consider two distributions on $\Theta = [0, 1]$ with PDFs

g_L and g_H as follows:

$$g_L(\theta) = \begin{cases} 1/3 & \text{if } \theta \in [0, 0.9]; \\ 140(1 - \theta) & \text{if } \theta \in (0.9, 1]. \end{cases}$$

$$g_H(\theta) = \begin{cases} 1/3 & \text{if } \theta \in [0, 0.9]; \\ 140(\theta - 0.9) & \text{if } \theta \in (0.9, 1]. \end{cases}$$

It follows that g_H dominates g_L in the sense of likelihood ratio. Fixing $u_0 = -0.2$ and $v_0 = -0.6$, the corresponding threshold values are $\bar{\theta}_H \approx 0.647$ and $\bar{\theta}_L \approx 0.652$. So $\bar{\theta}_H < \bar{\theta}_L$.

On the other hand, consider another two PDFs \hat{g}_L and \hat{g}_H as follows:

$$\hat{g}_L(\theta) = 1 \text{ and } \hat{g}_H(\theta) = 10\theta^9, \forall \theta \in [0, 1].$$

It follows that \hat{g}_H dominates \hat{g}_L in the sense of likelihood ratio. Fixing $u_0 = -0.2$ and $v_0 = -0.6$, the corresponding threshold values are $\bar{\theta}'_H \approx 0.970$ and $\bar{\theta}'_L \approx 0.424$. So $\bar{\theta}'_H > \bar{\theta}'_L$.

A7 Proof of Proposition 4

The proof is similar to that of Proposition 1.

Step 1: Pointwise Optimization.

Fixing $\hat{v} \leq v_0$, constraints (I) imply

$$\tilde{p}(\theta) = \frac{\hat{v} - \tilde{a}(\theta)}{v_0 - \tilde{a}(\theta)}. \quad (8)$$

Equation (8) implies that $\tilde{p}(\theta) \leq 1$ is equivalent to $\hat{v} \leq \underline{v}$ and that $\tilde{p}(\theta) \geq 0$ is equivalent to $\hat{v} \geq \tilde{a}(\theta)$. Substituting Equation (8) into the principal's utility, the optimization

problem (\mathcal{M}_1) is reduced to

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\tilde{a}(\theta) \in A} \left(\frac{\hat{v} - \tilde{a}(\theta)}{v_0 - \tilde{a}(\theta)} \right) u - \left(\frac{v_0 - \hat{v}}{v_0 - \tilde{a}(\theta)} \right) (\tilde{a}(\theta) - \theta)^2 \\ & \text{subject to } \tilde{a}(\theta) \leq \hat{v}, \forall \theta \in \Theta. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The solution to problem (9) is

$$\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \begin{cases} \hat{v} & \text{if } (v_0 - \theta)^2 + u_0 < 0, \\ \min\{\hat{v}, \varphi(\theta)\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

where $\varphi(\theta) = v_0 - \sqrt{(v_0 - \theta)^2 + u_0}$.

Step 2: Optimal \hat{v} .

Based on Equation (10), we derive the optimal \hat{v} for different values of u_0 and v_0 characterized by the following three cases:

- (i) $u_0 + (v_0 - 1)^2 \geq 0$. In this case, $u_0 + (v_0 - \theta)^2 \geq 0$ for all $\theta \in [0, 1]$.
- (ii) $u_0 + v_0^2 > 0$ and $u_0 + (v_0 - 1)^2 < 0$. In this case, $u_0 + (v_0 - \theta)^2 \geq 0$ for $\theta \in [0, \sqrt{-u_0} + v_0]$ and $u_0 + (\theta - v_0)^2 < 0$ for $\theta \in (\sqrt{-u_0} + v_0, 1]$.
- (iii) $u_0 + v_0^2 \leq 0$. In this case, $u_0 + (v_0 - \theta)^2 \leq 0$ for all $\theta \in [0, 1]$.

The global solutions of case (i) and case (ii) are the same:

1. If $\varphi(0) \geq \mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$, $\hat{v}^* = \mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$. The actions are pooled at $\tilde{a}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$.
2. If $\varphi(0) < \mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$, $\hat{v}^* = \bar{v}$ where \bar{v} is given by

$$\int_0^{\varphi^{-1}(\bar{v})} \varphi(\theta) - \bar{v} dG(\theta) + \bar{v} - \mathbb{E}_G(\theta) = 0$$

The action function $\tilde{a}(\theta)$ is as follows:

- when $\theta \in [0, \varphi^{-1}(\bar{v})]$, the default action a_0 is chosen with probability $\frac{\bar{v}-\varphi(\theta)}{v_0-\varphi(\theta)}$ and the action $\tilde{a}(\theta) = \varphi(\theta)$ is chosen with the complementary probability;
- when $\theta \in [\varphi^{-1}(\bar{v}), 1]$, $\tilde{a}(\theta) = \bar{v}$.

We could further show that $\bar{v} \in (\mathbb{E}_G(\theta), 1)$. Let $f(\hat{v}) = \int_0^{\varphi^{-1}(\hat{v})} \varphi(\theta) - \hat{v} dG(\theta) + \hat{v} - \mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$. Then, \bar{v} is the solution to $f(\hat{v}) = 0$. $f(\hat{v})$ is strictly increasing:

$$f'(\hat{v}) = \int_{\varphi^{-1}(\hat{v})}^1 1 dG(\theta) > 0.$$

At the two points $\hat{v} = \mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$ and $\hat{v} = 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbb{E}_G(\theta)) &= - \int_0^{\varphi^{-1}(\mathbb{E}_G(\theta))} \mathbb{E}_G(\theta) - \varphi(\theta) dG(\theta) < 0 \\ f(1) &= \int_0^{\varphi^{-1}(1)} \varphi(\theta) - 1 dG(\theta) + 1 - \mathbb{E}_G(\theta) \\ &= \int_0^{\varphi^{-1}(1)} \varphi(\theta) - \theta dG(\theta) + \int_{\varphi^{-1}(1)}^1 1 - \theta dG(\theta) > 0 \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\bar{v} \in (\mathbb{E}_G(\theta), 1)$.

The condition for **Case I** and **Case II** combined is $u_0 + v_0^2 > 0$. Furthermore, the condition for the pooled action $\varphi(0) \geq \mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$ is equivalent to $(v_0 - \mathbb{E}_G(\theta))^2 \geq u_0 + v_0^2$. Therefore,

- When $(v_0 - \mathbb{E}_G(\theta))^2 \geq u_0 + v_0^2 > 0$, the actions are pooled at $\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$;
- When $(v_0 - \mathbb{E}_G(\theta))^2 < u_0 + v_0^2$, the optimal action rule $(\tilde{a}^*, \tilde{p}^*)$ is the same as equations (2) in Proposition 1.

For **Case III**, the principal optimally sets $\hat{v}^* = \mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$, resulting in pooled action $\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_G(\theta)$.

Proposition 4 summarizes the analysis above. In particular, the cases $(v_0 - \mathbb{E}_G(\theta))^2 \geq u_0 + v_0^2 > 0$ and $u_0 + v_0^2 \leq 0$ both result in the pooled action and are stated in part (b)

of the proposition. The case $(v_0 - \mathbb{E}_G(\theta))^2 < u_0 + v_0^2$ corresponds to part (a) of the proposition. For expositional purpose, we use \bar{a} to denote \bar{v} in the proposition.

A8 Derivations of two cases when $v_0 \in (0, 1)$

A8.1 U-shaped $\tilde{a}^*(\theta)$ and $\tilde{p}^*(\theta)$

The parameters under concern are $v_0 = 0.38$, $u_0 = -0.1$ and $g(\theta) = 1$ for all $\theta \in [0, 1]$.

Lemma 1 still applies. We can focus on the class of veto mechanisms when searching for a principal's optimal mechanism and decompose the principal's maximization problem into two sequential problems (\mathcal{M}_1) and (\mathcal{M}_2) . The solution to (\mathcal{M}_1) is different when $\hat{v} \geq v_0$ and $\hat{v} \leq v_0$. And we consider the two cases separately.

Case I: $\hat{v} \geq v_0$ When $\hat{v} \geq v_0$, we have $\tilde{a}(\theta) \geq v_0$ for all $\theta \in [0, 1]$. The solution to (\mathcal{M}_1) is the same as the solution for the case $v_0 \leq 0$.

$$\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \begin{cases} \hat{v} & \text{if } (\theta - v_0)^2 + u_0 < 0, \\ \max\{\hat{v}, \eta(\theta)\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where $\eta(\theta) = \sqrt{(\theta - v_0)^2 + u_0} + v_0$. Plugging in the parameter values, we have

1. If $\hat{v} \in [v_0, \sqrt{0.0444} + 0.38]$,

$$\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \begin{cases} \hat{v} & \text{if } \underline{\theta} < \theta < \bar{\theta}, \\ \sqrt{(\theta - 0.38)^2 - 0.1} + 0.38 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where $\underline{\theta} = 0.38 - \sqrt{(\hat{v} - 0.38)^2 + 0.1}$ and $\bar{\theta} = 0.38 + \sqrt{(\hat{v} - 0.38)^2 + 0.1}$.

2. If $\hat{v} \in [\sqrt{0.0444} + 0.38, \sqrt{0.2844} + 0.38]$,

$$\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \begin{cases} \hat{v} & \text{if } \theta < \bar{\theta}, \\ \sqrt{(\theta - 0.38)^2 - 0.1} + 0.38 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where $\bar{\theta} = 0.38 + \sqrt{(\hat{v} - 0.38)^2 + 0.1}$.

3. If $\hat{v} \geq \sqrt{0.2844} + 0.38$, $\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \hat{v}$.

Next, we solve the maximization problem (\mathcal{M}_2) . The optimal \hat{v} is within the range $\hat{v} \in [v_0, \sqrt{0.0444} + 0.38]$ and given by the below FOC:

$$\int_0^{\underline{\theta}} \eta(\theta) - \hat{v} d\theta + \int_{\bar{\theta}}^1 \eta(\theta) - \hat{v} d\theta + \hat{v} - \frac{1}{2} = 0, \quad (11)$$

where $\eta(\theta) = \sqrt{(\theta - 0.38)^2 - 0.1} + 0.38$, $\underline{\theta} = 0.38 - \sqrt{(\hat{v} - 0.38)^2 + 0.1}$ and $\bar{\theta} = 0.38 + \sqrt{(\hat{v} - 0.38)^2 + 0.1}$ as calculated when solving (\mathcal{M}_1) . Solving equation (11) numerically gives $\hat{v}^* \approx 0.397$, $\underline{\theta} \approx 0.063$ and $\bar{\theta} \approx 0.697$.

Case II: $\hat{v} \leq v_0$ When $\hat{v} \leq v_0$, we have $\tilde{a}(\theta) \leq v_0$ for all $\theta \in [0, 1]$. The solution to (\mathcal{M}_1) is the same as the solution for the case $v_0 \geq 1$.

$$\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \begin{cases} \hat{v} & \text{if } (v_0 - \theta)^2 + u_0 < 0, \\ \min\{\hat{v}, \varphi(\theta)\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where $\varphi(\theta) = v_0 - \sqrt{(v_0 - \theta)^2 + u_0}$. Plugging in the parameter values, we have

1. If $\hat{v} \in [0.38 - \sqrt{0.0444}, v_0]$,

$$\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \begin{cases} \hat{v} & \text{if } \underline{\theta} < \theta < \bar{\theta}, \\ 0.38 - \sqrt{(\theta - 0.38)^2 - 0.1} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where $\underline{\theta} = 0.38 - \sqrt{(\hat{v} - 0.38)^2 + 0.1}$ and $\bar{\theta} = 0.38 + \sqrt{(\hat{v} - 0.38)^2 + 0.1}$.

2. If $\hat{v} \in [0.38 - \sqrt{0.2844}, 0.38 - \sqrt{0.0444}]$,

$$\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \begin{cases} \hat{v} & \text{if } \theta < \bar{\theta}, \\ 0.38 - \sqrt{(\theta - 0.38)^2 - 0.1} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where $\bar{\theta} = 0.38 + \sqrt{(\hat{v} - 0.38)^2 + 0.1}$.

3. If $\hat{v} \leq 0.38 - \sqrt{0.2844}$, $\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \hat{v}$.

Next, we solve the maximization problem (\mathcal{M}_2). The optimal \hat{v} is within the range $\hat{v} \in [0.38 - \sqrt{0.0444}, v_0]$ and given by the below FOC:

$$2\left[\int_0^{\underline{\theta}} \hat{v} - \varphi(\theta) d\theta + \int_{\bar{\theta}}^1 \hat{v} - \varphi(\theta) d\theta + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \hat{v}\right)\right] > 0$$

for all $\hat{v} \in [0.38 - \sqrt{0.0444}, v_0 = 0.38]$. Therefore, we obtain a corner solution $\hat{v}^* = v_0 = 0.38$.

Combining the two cases, the optimal solution is obtained when $\hat{v}^* \approx 0.397$.

A8.2 Optimal veto mechanism can be deterministic

We follow the same procedures as in the previous proof of Appendix A8.1.

Case I: $\hat{v} \geq v_0$ The solution to (\mathcal{M}_1) is the same as the solution for the case $v_0 \leq 0$.

1. If $\hat{v} \in [v_0 = 0.5, \sqrt{0.25 + u_0} + 0.5]$,

$$\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \begin{cases} \hat{v} & \text{if } \underline{\theta} \leq \theta \leq \bar{\theta}, \\ \sqrt{(\theta - 0.5)^2 + u_0} + 0.5 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where $\underline{\theta} = 0.5 - \sqrt{(\hat{v} - 0.5)^2 - u_0}$ and $\bar{\theta} = 0.5 + \sqrt{(\hat{v} - 0.5)^2 - u_0}$.

2. If $\hat{v} \geq \sqrt{0.25 + u_0} + 0.5$, $\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \hat{v}$.

Next, we solve the maximization problem (\mathcal{M}_2). The optimal \hat{v} is within the range $[v_0, \sqrt{0.25 + u_0} + 0.5]$ and the first-order term is negative for all $\hat{v} \in [v_0, \sqrt{0.25 + u_0} + 0.5]$.

$$-2\left[\int_0^{\underline{\theta}} \eta(\theta) - \hat{v} d\theta + \int_{\bar{\theta}}^1 \eta(\theta) - \hat{v} d\theta + \left(\hat{v} - \frac{1}{2}\right)\right] < 0$$

Therefore, we obtain a corner solution $\hat{v}^* = v_0 = 0.5$.

Case II: $\hat{v} \leq v_0$ The solution to (\mathcal{M}_1) is the same as the solution for the case $v_0 \geq 1$.

1. If $\hat{v} \in [0.5 - \sqrt{0.25 + u_0}, v_0 = 0.5]$,

$$\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \begin{cases} \hat{v} & \text{if } \underline{\theta} \leq \theta \leq \bar{\theta}, \\ 0.5 - \sqrt{(\theta - 0.5)^2 + u_0} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where $\underline{\theta} = 0.5 - \sqrt{(\hat{v} - 0.5)^2 - u_0}$ and $\bar{\theta} = 0.5 + \sqrt{(\hat{v} - 0.5)^2 - u_0}$.

2. If $\hat{v} \leq 0.5 - \sqrt{0.25 + u_0}$, $\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \hat{v}$.

Next, we solve the maximization problem (\mathcal{M}_2) . The optimal \hat{v} is within the range $\hat{v} \in [0.5 - \sqrt{0.25 + u_0}, v_0]$ and the first-order term is positive for all $\hat{v} \in [0.5 - \sqrt{0.25 + u_0}, v_0]$.

$$2 \left[\int_0^{\underline{\theta}} \hat{v} - \varphi(\theta) d\theta + \int_{\bar{\theta}}^1 \hat{v} - \varphi(\theta) d\theta + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \hat{v}\right) \right] > 0$$

Therefore, we obtain a corner solution $\hat{v}^* = v_0$.

Combining the two cases, we obtain that in the solution $\hat{v}^* = v_0$. Then $\underline{\theta}^* = 0.5 - \sqrt{-u_0}$ and $\bar{\theta}^* = 0.5 + \sqrt{-u_0}$. And both cases correspond to the veto probability:

$$\tilde{p}^*(\theta) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \underline{\theta}^* \leq \theta \leq \bar{\theta}^*, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since the principal vetoes with probability 1 when $\theta \in [0, \underline{\theta}^*)$ and $\theta \in (\bar{\theta}^*, 1]$, $\tilde{a}^*(\theta)$ can take any value. When $\theta \in [\underline{\theta}^*, \bar{\theta}^*]$, we have $\tilde{a}^*(\theta) = \hat{v}^*$.

Using the language of veto mechanism, the equivalent equilibrium is that the principal does not veto if and only if the proposed action is $a = v_0$ and that the agent proposes $a = v_0$ if and only if the realized state $\theta \in [\underline{\theta}^*, \bar{\theta}^*]$.

A9 Proof of Proposition 5

Proof. Denote by \hat{F}_θ the CDF of the action distribution with support in A . Then \hat{F}_θ can be expressed as a convex combination of H_{a_0} and a CDF F_θ whose support lies in

$(-\infty, M]$: $\hat{F}_\theta = p(\theta)H_{a_0} + (1 - p(\theta))F_\theta$, where $p(\theta)$ is the probability mass that \hat{F}_θ puts on a_0 . Denote by \hat{v} the agent's expected payoff. Constraints (I) require that

$$p(\theta)v_0 + (1 - p(\theta)) \int_{-\infty}^M \left((1 - \gamma)(1 - a) + \gamma(1 - a)^2 \right) dF_\theta(a) = \hat{v} \text{ for all } \theta \in \Theta.$$

To solve for a principal's preferred mechanism, we can still first fix some \hat{v} and find the corresponding optimal mechanism, and then solve for the optimal \hat{v} . Fixing \hat{v} and $p(\theta)$, the principal solves the following state-wise optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{F_\theta} \int_{-\infty}^M -(a - \theta)^2 dF_\theta \\ & \text{subject to (1) } \int_{-\infty}^M \left((1 - \gamma)(1 - a) + \gamma(1 - a)^2 \right) dF_\theta(a) = \hat{v} - p(\theta)v_0; \\ & \quad (2) F_\theta \text{ is a CDF with support in } (-\infty, M]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mu_\theta \equiv \int_{-\infty}^M a dF_\theta$ and $\sigma_\theta \equiv \int_A (a - \mu_\theta)^2 dF_\theta$. The principal's optimization problem is equivalent to

$$\min_{\mu_\theta, \sigma_\theta} \sigma_\theta - 2\theta\mu_\theta + \mu_\theta^2 \quad \text{subject to } \gamma(\sigma_\theta + (\mu_\theta)^2) - (1 + \gamma)\mu_\theta = v_\theta, \mu_\theta \leq M, \text{ and } \sigma_\theta \geq 0.$$

where v_θ is a constant given θ . Rewriting the problem by substituting the equality constraint into the objective function yields:

$$\min_{\mu_\theta, \sigma_\theta} \frac{v_\theta}{\gamma} + \left(\frac{1 + \gamma}{\gamma} - 2\theta \right) \mu_\theta \quad \text{subject to } \gamma(\sigma_\theta + (\mu_\theta)^2) - (1 + \gamma)\mu_\theta = v_\theta, \mu_\theta \leq M, \text{ and } \sigma_\theta \geq 0. \quad (12)$$

Since $\frac{1 + \gamma}{\gamma} - 2\theta$ is always positive, the objective function is strictly increasing in μ_θ . Moreover, the equality constraint in optimization (12) imply that μ_θ strictly increases as σ_θ increases. We obtain that in the solution $\sigma_\theta = 0$ regardless of the state θ ; that is, F_θ is degenerate for all θ . Therefore, it suffices to focus on veto mechanisms when searching for a principal's preferred mechanism. \square