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***Abstract:***

The main objective of this study is to analyze the equity issues of the Romanian pension system. The analysis is carried out at two levels: the nationwide one, aimed at identifying the welfare implications of recent reforms adopted by the Romanian government on the unitary system of pensions; the regional level, where we try to identify differences and similarities across counties with respect to nominal and real average benefits received by pensioners. The conclusions of the analysis show that the new pension law ended up with an increase of the average benefit for high pensions, while low benefits remained practically the same as they were before the reform. At regional level, in most of the counties the average real pension (indexed by the cost of living) is above the nominal one.

1. **Introduction: sustainability versus adequacy of pension systems in the economic literature**

Ample debates have taken place during the last decade with respect to the sustainability of pension systems, in particular in developed countries, where the population ageing represents a real challenge. The phenomenon is also present in an increasing number of emerging economies (Holzmann, 2009, Holzmann et al, 2008 and Lee et al, 2010) and is particularly stringent in Eastern European countries (Mitra, 2008). The EC (2010) Green Paper and the EC (2011) Ageing Report draw very somber demographic perspectives for Europe, where the ageing is accompanied by low fertility rates (Cremer et al, 2009). At global level, the World Bank identifies similar tendencies for the future (Holzmann et all, 2009a).

Demographic challenges are equally present in Romania, where the population decline is expected to accelerate. The number of inhabitants will decrease from 21.4 million in 2008 to 16-17 million in 2050 (APAPR, 2012), which is equivalent to a reduction by almost 25% as compared to the 1990 level. At the same time, the increase of life expectancy will accentuate the ageing phenomenon over the next three decades: according to Fernandez-Ansola and Klemm (2007) in 2050 one out of three Romanians will be aged above 65 years, as compared to 14% in 2000.

The demographic perspectives call for major reforms of the existing systems in a large number of countries; without such reforms, the pension schemes will face increasing and unsustainable spending paths over the next four decades (IMF, 2011), which will induce either a drastic reduction of benefits or an increase of the tax burden in the economy (Ponds and Yermo, 2011). In addition, the 2008 economic crisis has exacerbated the sustainability risks of the pension systems (Ramaswamy, 2012). Although important reforms have been initiated in many countries (increase of retirement age, introduction of privately funded schemes, increase of contribution rates, and even the reduction of pension benefits), with net positive results (Karam et al, 2010) further reforms are necessary to ensure long run fiscal sustainability (Zaidi and Rejniak, 2010).

In case of Romania, the sustainability of the pension system is already menaced. The deficit accumulated by the public system represented about 50% of the collected contributions in 2010 (Zaman, 2012). Although each additional year of increase in retirement age reduces the deficit by 0.7% of GDP (Fernandez-Ansola and Klemm, 2007), the public pillar will continue generating deficits that areexpected to grow for the next three decades relative to GDP (Holzmann and Guven, 2009). Revenues are expected to decline from 6.6% of GDP in 2008 to 3.4% by2050, while expenditures to increase from 7.2% to 9.6% of GDP over the same period. The net result is thus aprojected deficit of 6.2% of GDP in 2050 (Holzmann and Guven, 2009).

Ensuring the pensions sustainability should not affect their adequacy, as many opinions are in favour of maintaining a sufficiently high pension/wage ratio in order to provide the retired persons with a decent income. The challenge of the pension systems to which most of the countries will be confronted in the future is therefore related to the trade-off between sustainability and adequacy (Zaidi, 2010). The solution to this dilemma resides in the identification of new “opportunities and collaborative strategies”, as underlined by Hayashi et al (2009). The private pension systems seem to represent the main solution in this respect, and the experience of Central and Eastern Europe with fully capitalised pension funds provides encouraging results (Allot et al, 2010). Apart from compulsory contributions to private pillars, the voluntary savings instruments are considered as a key instrument for raising the revenues to the social insurance budget (Holzman et al, 2009b).

In addition, another solution (Cigno, 2010) to avoid a pension crisis would be an intelligent system design, by developing two main elements of the public pension system: a classical Bismarckian scheme in which the individuals receive pensions according to their contributions during the active life, and a second scheme that qualifies individuals to a pension by having children and spending time at home to grow them up. However, the reality shows that there is a conflict between the economic rationale behind such a scheme and the simplicity required by the political process (Beetsma and Oksanem, 2008).

In terms of adequacy, the Romanian pension system records better replacement ratio and relative income levels than the EU average: in 2010 the aggregate replacement ratio in Romania was 12 percentage points above the EU average, with men recording a significantly higher ratio than women (10 pp, as compared to only 4 pp in EU). The median relative income of persons aged +65 was 97 in Romania (88 in EU), with the same considerable gender gap (15 pp, versus 6 pp in EU). This means that Romanian pensioners receive an average benefit that is almost equal to the average income of active people. At the same time, when retiring, the pensioner’s benefit as a share of his/her previous wage is substantially superior to the same ratio of an EU pensioner. Pensions for full-career workers in Romania can be therefore consideredadequate,with levels of incomereplacement higher than regionaland world averages(Holzmann and Guven, 2009). However, IMF (2011) expects that the replacement rate will decline by about 15 percentage points over the period 2010 – 2050. To some extent, the excellent adequacy ratio of Romanian benefits is the result of purposely increase of pensions by the successive governments, which use the category of retired persons as a mass of manoeuvre for electoral purposes (Preda and Grigoras, 2011).

The sustainability issue of the public pension systems has been amply analyzed by many specialists (see, for example Barr, 2006 and Barr & Diamond, 2006). One proposed solution is the reduction of benefits as a share in average salary, as it happened in Great Britain. Other economists propose to increase the retirement age in one step, not gradually, in order to reduce the deficit (Sayan and Kiraci, 2000).

1. **Main characteristics of the Romanian pension system**

Romania uses a mixed financing scheme of old-age pensions. The unfunded scheme, of PAYG type, consists of Pillar I (public, compulsory) based on intergenerational solidarity. Pillar II (private, compulsory) represents the funded component of the system. A voluntary scheme (Pillar III) was introduced in May 2007 as part of the pension reform.

The first pillar replaced the former PAYG scheme inherited from the communist period. It covers the employed persons with individual labour contract, civil servants, diplomatic personnel, legislative and juridical authorities, craft cooperative members, and recipients of unemployment benefits. The pension benefits are calculated on the basis of individuals’ accumulated points, which are determined by contributor’s wage relative to the average wage in the economy. Since January 2011 the point value has been set at RON 732.8, which is equivalent to EURO 174. The contribution rates depend on the working conditions; currently, they represent 31.3% for normal conditions, 36.3% for arduous conditions, respectively 41.3% for very arduous conditions. The employee contributes by 10.5% in all situations, the difference being covered by the employer.

A special regime exists within the unfunded scheme – the so called “service pensions” – for magistrates, judges and prosecutors. In November 2011, 2837 persons benefited from this scheme; their average pension amounted to RON 9034 (EURO 2146), of which 88.6% paid from the state budget and the rest from the contributions to the Pillar I.

In 2009, the Romanian government introduced, equally as an unfunded scheme, the *minimum guaranteed social pension*, financed exclusively from the state budget. In 2010, this benefit was renamed *social indemnity for pensioners* but the granting rules remained the same.

The second pillar of the system was introduced in 2007 as a compulsory scheme for all persons below the age of 35 at January 1st 2008 and optional for those aged between 36 and 45 years at that date. It is a Defined Contribution (DC) scheme, with benefits calculated on the basis of individuals’ contributions and investment earnings. The starting contribution rate represented 2%, which will gradually increase by 0.5 percentage points every year, to reach 6% by the end of 2016. In December 2011, a total of 5.52 million contributors were recorded with the second pillar, where 9 pension funds were active.

The third pillar was introduced in May 2007, equally as a DC system, and is alimented through voluntary contributions; the individual contribution rate is limited at maximum 15% of the gross wage. In December 2011 there were 260.4 thousand persons contributing to the voluntary pillar, where 13 pension funds were accredited to collect voluntary contributions.

The standard retirement age is 63 years for women and 65 years for men, to be reached by the end of 2014, (although, some authors believe that retirement age should be equal for men and women, given that men retired in Romania benefit from their pensions about 19 years, while women average benefit from pension is about 24 years, spending more years benefiting from the pension than the number of years they spent contributing to the fund, (Preda and Grigoras, 2011)), when the standard contribution period giving rights to full pension benefits will attain 30 years for women and respectively 35 years for men. Currently (January 2012) the retirement age is 59 years and 3 months for women and 64 years and 3 months for men, while the full contribution period 28.5 years for women and 33.5 years for men.

The Romanian old-age pension system allows for premature retirement under two different schemes: early retirement, respectively partial early retirement. The first scheme concerns the employees aged maximum 5 years below the legal age of retirement who contributed for at least 8 years above the standard contribution period. The partial early retirement is allowed for those having completed their contribution period and aged maximum 5 years below the legal retirement age. In case of partial early retirement, the benefit is penalised by 0.75% for each month below the legal age of retirement.

The reform of the Romanian pension system started with the adoption of Law 19/2000, which replaced the former public scheme inherited from the communist period by a new system (Pillar I) based on pension points. Four years later, the Law 411/2004 introduced the second compulsory pillar in the system, which is privately administrated through individual accounts. These initial reforms were completed by the adoption of Law 204/2006, which introduced the third (voluntary) pillar, equally privately administrated.

In 2008 the Law 263/2008 was adopted; the act defines the contributory scheme for farmers, which were previously exempted from paying contributions but benefited from pensions paid from the Social Insurance budget of the first pillar of the system. The contributory scheme is based on a twining mechanism: the personal contribution is complemented by the state budget through the so called *mutual contributory unit*. The state contribution is generally 2 or 3 times higher than the personal contribution of individuals.

In 2010 the parliament passed the Law 263/2010 on the unified public pension system, which replaces all the previously adopted legislation in the field. The new law, which entered into force on 1st January 2011, unified the various public regimes into a single one under the first pillar of the system. Military and police personnel, lawyers, high officials and related professional categories that benefited from “special pension regimes” were included in the public system. At the same time, according to a Government Emergency Ordinance from November 2011, all the employees belonging to these professional categories have to adhere to a pension fund of the second pillar by July 2012. The contribution rules, the benefit entitlement and the retirement age were equally harmonized, which required the adoption of a long and complex mechanism for recalculating those special pensions. The obligation to pay contributions was extended for self-employed and related categories.

The law introduced more restrictive conditions for early retirement and partial early retirement by penalising up to 45% the pension benefit in case of incomplete contributory period or when retirement takes place before the standard age. This measure was imposed by the large number of early retirements hat have been recorded since 2001, when the first law on pension reform entered into force: in only 5 years after the adoption of the law, Romania recorded 6.7 times more early retirements according to the official statistics.

The regime of granting disability pensions is equally revised in the new law, by hardening the retirement conditions for this category. The number of disability retirements passed from 208,000 in 1990 to 920,000 in 2009, when the share of disability pensioners represented 16% of the total number of retirement beneficiaries (Soare, 2010). Since a relatively large proportion of beneficiaries obtained fraudulently the disability status and therefore the benefit, the law stipulates the obligation of medical re-expertise of all existing beneficiaries of a disability pension.

An important way to support the pension system is represented by a complementary aspect to be taken into account by managers of the public system, which can positively affect the older population problem in Romania, namely, taking into account the effects of pension reform on the labour supply, and especially the increased involvement of older workers in activities that create new value, considering the fact that labour supply of the older workers is responsive to changes in retirement incentives, while that of the younger workers is less responsive (French and Jones, 2012). In this respect, decision-makers in Romania in this area did not discuss and decide on the necessary framework regulation, especially targeting the young people issues aimed at sustaining their labour market insertion.

In this sense, according to some studies (Karlström et al., 2011), should be considered behavioural responses in measuring the welfare effect of these reforms, the authors that we remember discovering that, in addition, these behavioural responses affect the measure of the welfare distribution effects of the pension systems reform.

1. **Equity issues at national level**

The adoption of the unitary pension system in January 2011 ended up with an increase of the received benefits for about 10% of pensioners, when compared to the average net wage in the economy. Overall, the average pension passed from 49.02% (in March 2009) to 50.1% (in April 2012) as a share in the net average salary, with major fluctuations over the entire period (Figure 1). A maximum of 55.37% was reached in October 2010, and respectively a minimum of 48.44% was recorded in December 2011. In average, between March 2009 and April 2012 the average pension represented 52.17% of the average monthly wage.

There is therefore a net welfare improvement of the benefits granted in average to retired people during the last three years. However, the public system continues to depict tremendous discrepancies between low and high pension benefits. Currently the system pays pensions ranging from less that RON 40 (EURO 8.2 at August 2012 exchange rate), as well as exceptionally high pensions to about 3000 persons who receive in average RON 9034 (EURO 2007) per month (Zaman, 2012), which is 10 times higher than the average old-age pension. In October 2011, the total monthly pensions received by these 3000 retired persons represented almost 50% of the total amount of social pensions granted to 620 thousand beneficiaries.

***Figure 1:Share of average pension in the net average wage (%)***

*Source: Calculation based on data from**National House of Pensions and Other Social Insurance Rights,*

<http://www.cnpas.org/portal/mediatype/html/language/ro/user/anon/page/default.psml/template/generic?url=%2Fcontent%2Fcnpas%2Fstatistics.html&title=Indicatori+statistici+pilon+I>

The 2010 reform was principally aimed at reducing the pension expenditures over medium and long run, such that the current deficit will be brought to manageable levels. As a second important objective, the law was supposed to reduce the existing inequalities in terms of benefits. However, the mechanism adopted for recalculating the special pensions of military and police personnel ended up with an increase of the average monthly pension of this category from RON 1755 to RON 2289. Overall, the recalculation led to about RON 1 billion additional spending for 2012. Designed to reduce the gap between the average benefit of special regimes and the average social insurance pension, the recalculation widened actually the differences: while the 2012 budget for social insurance pensions increased by only 0.5%, the budget allocated to the military pensioners augmented by 9%, and that of former police and secret service employees by 5 and respectively 6% (Zaman, 2012).

As Figure 2 shows, the distribution of pensioners shifted towards higher benefits. In fact, the number of persons receiving very low pensions (below RON 100 – EURO 22) increased by 10%, with the highest increase (23%) being recorded for the lowest pensions (less than RON 40). In case of low to medium pensions (between RON 41 and 900) the number of beneficiaries declined by 6.4% as a result of recalculation. An increase of the number of recipients is observed for medium to high pension benefits (above RON 901), in average by 12.73% - with the highest increase recorded in case of pensions above RON 5000 (32.14%). The total number of beneficiaries entitled to a social pension, which is granted if the effective benefit falls below the RON 350 threshold, declined by 3.11%.

***Figure 2: Distribution of pensioners before (January 2011 – J11)***

***and after (January 2012 – J12) recalculation***

*Source: Calculation based on data from**National House of Pensions and Other Social Insurance Rights,*

<http://www.cnpas.org/portal/mediatype/html/language/ro/user/anon/page/default.psml/template/generic?url=%2Fcontent%2Fcnpas%2Fstatistics.html&title=Indicatori+statistici+pilon+I>

It is interesting to note that the distribution depicted in Figure 2 has three picks. The first one corresponds to the pension interval 601-700, which is very close to the average amount of social insurance pension. The second pick is observed for the interval 801 – 900, which corresponds practically to the average old-age pension. The third (1001 – 1500) is associated with the average benefit paid to the pensioners belonging to the special regime.

There is therefore a segregated distribution of pension beneficiaries in Romania. Although 45.7% of total number of pensioners is concentrated within the interval around the average benefit (RON 501-1000), there are two extreme categories of beneficiaries. The first one groups very low pensions (below RON 400) and represents 18% of the total number of beneficiaries (Figure 2). This category is mainly composed of retired farmers, disability pensioners and early retired persons. Despite several attempts to solve the problem of farmers, who do not pay social contributions, the successive Romanian governments failed to find a solution. This category is therefore granted very low pensions from the state budget, usually accompanied by a social pension. The number of disability pensioners has increased tremendously over the transition period, although a significant share of them obtained this status by bribing the corrupted medical system. For many such false disability pensioners this represented an alternative to unemployment during the difficult times of transition. Early retirement has been encouraged for many years by the government in order to cope with the labour hoarding phenomenon in state owned companies; in spite of much more restrictive conditions for early retirement, this practice remains a better alternative to unemployment for a part of senior workers who do not find jobs.

The second extreme category of pensioners is represented by the privileged professions grouped under the “special regime” scheme. They benefit from relatively high pensions (above RON 2000), but their share in total is just 4% (Figure 3) while receiving 13.52% of the total pension fund. This amount is 3.5 times higher than the cumulated pensions of those benefiting from a social pension, whose proportion in the total number of pensioners accounts for 12.76%.

***Figure 3: Distribution of beneficiaries by main pension intervals (January 2012)***

*Source:**calculations based on data from National House of Pensions and Other Social Insurance Rights,*

<http://www.cnpas.org/portal/mediatype/html/language/ro/user/anon/page/default.psml/template/generic?url=%2Fcontent%2Fcnpas%2Fstatistics.html&title=Indicatori+statistici+pilon+I>

If compared to the pension point value (RON 732 in June 2012), which is the reference for calculating the effective benefits, 59.15% of retired persons receive up to this amount. When considering the average net wage in the economy (RON 1552 in June 2012), 14% of retired persons benefit from a pension that is higher than this monthly average salary. Since by law the objective set by the government is to ensure an average pension benefit equivalent to 45% of the average wage, which represents RON 698 in June 2012, it follows that only 46.3% of the total number of pensioners receives a benefit that is superior to this threshold.

1. **Equity issues at regional level**

The recent reform of the public pension system has equally impacted the benefits at the county level. As Figure 4 shows, the average pension increased in all counties, but at different rates. As compared to March 2009, in May 2012 the average pension at national level was 13.3% higher. In 24 counties the increase was below the country’s average, with the lowest recorded in Satu Mare (9.99%), Covasna (10.18%) and Arad (10.2%). At the same time, 18 counties experienced an increase of the average benefit above the national average; the highest such increase is observed in Galati (17.06%), Gorj (15.77%), and Valcea (15.39%).

***Figure 4: Net average pension at county level in March 2009 and May 2012***

*Source:**calculations based on data from National House of Pensions and Other Social Insurance Rights,*

<http://www.cnpas.org/portal/mediatype/html/language/ro/user/anon/page/default.psml/template/generic?url=%2Fcontent%2Fcnpas%2Fstatistics.html&title=Indicatori+statistici+pilon+I>

However, for equity reasons it is important to compare the nominal average benefit in a specific county with the real one – discounted by the cost of living. One way of determining the real pension is to adjust its nominal level by a “cost of life index” expressed as the ratio between the average wage of a specific county and the average wage at country level. The wage rate in a particular zone (county, region) is generally a function of the life expensiveness; as a result, in counties where the average salary is below the national average the life is less expensive, while salaries higher than the country’s average indicate a more expensive life than the national average.

Using therefore this index, we computed the real average pension at county level and compared it with the nominal one (Figure 5). It can be seen that in only 4 counties (Ilfov, Bucuresti, Sibiu, Cluj) the real pension is inferior to the nominal one, with the largest gap being recorded in case of Bucharest, where the real pension represents only 69.6% of the nominal one. These are economically the most developed counties of Romania, which implies that rapid economic development induces high costs of living. The development is therefore beneficial for active persons, who see their salaries increasing well above the country’s average. Nevertheless, this is unfavourable for the retired people, who receive their pensions on the basis of contributions paid in the past, when the level of development (and consequently the salaries on which their contributions were calculated) was far below the current levels.

***Figure 5: Nominal versus real average monthly pension at county level (January 2012)***

*Source:**calculations based on data from National House of Pensions and Other Social Insurance Rights,*

<http://www.cnpas.org/portal/mediatype/html/language/ro/user/anon/page/default.psml/template/generic?url=%2Fcontent%2Fcnpas%2Fstatistics.html&title=Indicatori+statistici+pilon+I>

A relatively low ratio between real and nominal pensions is found in practically all developed counties (Brasov, Timis, Prahova, Constanta, etc.), which confirms the fact that the pensioners benefit much less from economic development than the active workers. The only exception is Gorj county, where the real pension represents 98.5% of the nominal one. In this particular case, the ratio is due to the fact that the region used to be a mono-industrial zone during the communist period and the first decade of transition, with mining representing the single major economic activity. The miners were allowed to retire much earlier than the standard age; consequently, the successive recalculations of pensions over the transition period affected negatively their average pension because of penalisations introduced for incomplete contributions periods.

At the opposite extreme, the relatively poor counties, such as Vrancea, Botosani or Suceava, record the highest ratio between the real and nominal pensions. Thus in less developed regions, where salaries are low, the retired persons – who receive their pension on the basis of past salaries, when the economic situation was more favourable – are better off than the active workers.

Obviously, the level of economic development is not entirely responsible for these discrepancies across counties; other factors play a role, such as the specificity of economic activities existing in a particular county or region for example. However, the development status is important. This is proved by the relatively large difference between nominal and real pensions when comparing the ratio between the highest and lowest level of the benefits: while the ratio between the largest (in Bucuresti) and lowest (in Giurgiu) nominal pension is only 1.57, the ratio between the highest (in Hunedoara) and lowest (in Ilfov) real pension amounts to 2.09.

It is also interesting to note that at regional level higher average pensions are found in those macro-regions where the number of pensioners is high (Figure 6): the highest average benefits is recorded in the Macro-Region 3, where 22.39% of total pensioners were living in March 2012. As a general trend, the average net pension at macro-regions level runs a clockwise rotation, descending from the highest level in MR 3 (RON 776) to the lowest level (RON 722) in MR 2. An identical clockwise trend is found for the regional GDP, which decreases from the maximum point (recorded in the capital city) to the minimum point of the East region.

***Figure 6: Net average pension and the number of retirees in March 2012***

******

*Source:**calculations based on data from National House of Pensions and Other Social Insurance Rights,*

<http://www.cnpas.org/portal/mediatype/html/language/ro/user/anon/page/default.psml/template/generic?url=%2Fcontent%2Fcnpas%2Fstatistics.html&title=Indicatori+statistici+pilon+I>

***Note: Net average pension is expressed in RON and the number of pensioners is expressed in person.***

***Table 1: Average pension and number of pensioners by region (March 2012)***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Macro-Region** | ***Micro-Region*** | ***Average pension (RON)*** | ***Number of pensioners*** |
| **MR1** | Centre | 792 | 577848 |
| North-West | 727 | 395675 |
| **MR2** | North-East | 710 | 493213 |
| South-East | 733 | 353560 |
| **MR3** | South Muntenia | ***707*** | 493213 |
| Bucuresti-Ilfov | **846** | 562273 |
| **MR4** | Sowth-West Oltenia | 729 | 309193 |
| West | 811 | 452653 |

*Source:**calculations based on data from National House of Pensions and Other Social Insurance Rights,*

<http://www.cnpas.org/portal/mediatype/html/language/ro/user/anon/page/default.psml/template/generic?url=%2Fcontent%2Fcnpas%2Fstatistics.html&title=Indicatori+statistici+pilon+I>

At more disaggregated territorial level (8 regions) the highest level of average pension exists in the Bucuresti-Ilfov area, which also records the highest average wage as a result of a more developed local economy (Table 1). At the same time, in western regions the average pension is higher than in the eastern part of the country. The lowest levels of pension benefits exist in South-East and South-Muntenia, where the level of economic development is lower due to preponderant agricultural activities.

1. **Concluding remarks**

In this study we briefly analysed the impact of the recent reform of the Romanian pension system on the benefits, both at national and regional level. The analysis is carried out from the perspectives of demographic and sustainability challenges to which the public system is confronted, as well as from equity point of view.

Over the last three years the average pension in the country continued to increase, but significant discrepancies exist between low and high benefits. The Romanian public system pays pensions lower than 8 EURO per month, as well as pensions above 2000 EURO monthly. Although the 2010 reformed was aimed at reducing these discrepancies, the measure ended up with a further increase of high pensions (by about 30%) in the detriment of low ones. Consequently, the distribution of beneficiaries according to the pension level shifted towards higher benefits after the implementation of reform.

The reform has therefore maintained and even improved for certain categories of beneficiaries the adequacy of pensions, but has accentuated the fiscal sustainability problems of the public system. With already a deficit of 50% of the amount of collected contributions in 2010, the budget of pensions faces a serious risk in the coming years. The expected demographic trends are unfavourable for Romania, while the ratio of beneficiaries to active workers is very low. In spite of very restrictive conditions imposed by the newly adopted law on early retirement and granting disability pensions, expected to reduce significantly the number of pensioners, the total number of beneficiaries in April 2012 (after 14 months of reform implementation) was just by 1.25% lower than in December 2010. Moreover, the number of persons benefiting from early retirement increased between December 2010 and April 2012 by more than 22%. The reform measures have been therefore inefficient also from this point of view, although – in addition to the constraints imposed to early and disability retirement – the statutory age of retirement continued to increase over the respective period.

At regional level, significant differences are observed across counties in terms of the average pension. Those where the agriculture is preponderant receive lower than the country’s average benefits, while in industrialized (and economically more developed) counties the average pension is well above the same average. However, in all counties the reform brought an increase of the nominal pension by 13.3%. In real terms (indexed by the cost of living), the pension is higher than the nominal one in the large majority of counties; only in five the most developed ones the real pension is inferior to the nominal one. This implies that the economic development, although beneficial for active workers through a relatively rapid increase in their wages, does not have the same beneficial effect for retired persons.

The discrepancies across counties is more important in terms of real pension than when considering the nominal one: while the ratio between the highest and the lowest counties in nominal terms is only 1.57, in real figures this ratio increase to 2.09. The same specificity remains when the regions are considered, with the particularity that the pension level seems to be positively correlated with the number of beneficiaries living in the region.

Concluding, the Romanian public pension system is characterised by a good level of adequacy, which is superior to the EU average, but experiences serious difficulties in terms of fiscal sustainability. Although the government tried to tackle this issue in its recent reform, there is no significant progress in terms of improving the sustainability; moreover, this aspect seems to be neglected by the reform package and the authorities are concerned almost exclusively by continuing to improve the benefits’ adequacy. To some extent, this is politically understandable because almost 5 million of retired persons represent around one quarter of voters. However, this policy is economically wrong and fiscally unsustainable.
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