

4 SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT ASPECTS BY REGIONAL LEVEL IN ROMANIA

Carmen Beatrice PĂUNA*
Dalina ANDREI**

The economic transition was harmful all over, but even more harmful for Romania's social landscape. The total population decreased by both birth rate and emigration and the work force follows this trend, the remaining people get older and demographic perspectives are even worse for the following decades. The poverty also gets larger and much larger in Romania than elsewhere in Europe and Central and Eastern Europe. Data show differences on regions and district areas, but under such circumstances, the fact that students and persons attending higher education institutions' courses increase their number and ratio in the total population does no longer represent a full social improvement, but this will feed the future emigration from Romania. The healthcare, social insurance, as well as educational and human resource systems are called to act against this situation, and some undertakings are under way.

Key words: human resources, poverty, emigration, labour market, immigrants, ageing index, activity rate, employment rate, unemployment rate, healthcare system, education system, social insurance.

JEL Classification: H55, H72 , I18 , I21, I28

Romania has faced deep transformations throughout the last 16 years, and the country's social development profile was so transformed. Given an increased *social vulnerability* and a continuous low *social services* financing (Annex 1) the Romanian State has undertaken a series of major reforms in *social insurance*, *public healthcare*, *education* and *social assistance*. However, these undertakings are yet unachieved and social difficulties and tensions have reached a high level.

1. Data on population, provided by the last censuses

The territorial spread of *population* has changed within 1992-2002, due to regional differences in natural population growth and to local and foreign people migration

* Senior Researcher of 2nd Degree at the Institute of Economic Forecasting.. E/mail address: Pauna.Carmen@gmx.at

** Researcher at the Institute of Economic Forecasting. E-mail address: dalinaandrei@yahoo.com



flows. Between the two censuses the total number of people has grown in only two territorial districts - *Iași* and *Ilfov* -, all the other districts recording negative growths. The people number dynamics were also different by regions, due to the social and economic development of every territorial district in part. In the territorial districts of high birth rates – like *Botoșani*, *Vaslui* and *Vrancea* – the population decreased less than 2%, as compared to more than 10%, as the maximum, in *Caraș-Severin* and *Hunedoara*. The latter districts had also lower birth rates than the country average one. The territorial differences of the mortality rate had contributed to such a result as well.

As for the *absolute people's number*, 16 districts kept, in 2002, less than 400 thousand inhabitants each (meaning 23.6% of Romania's total population), 6 districts plus Bucharest Municipality kept more than 700 thousand inhabitants each (meaning 29.7% of the total population), the rest of territorial districts keeping 400-700 thousand inhabitants each (meaning 46.7% of Romania's total population).

The same year, the *urban population* was dominant in 15 districts, among which the highest ratios were – in a decreasing order – in the districts of *Hunedoara* (75.9%), *Brașov* (74.0%) and *Constanța* (70.2%). On the contrary, the *rural population* was dominant in *Ilfov* (89.8%), *Dâmbovița* and *Giurgiu* (about 70% for both of the last). In most of the districts, as well as on the whole country average, the urban population's weight in the total population decreased since 1992, except for: *Ilfov*, *Alba*, *Dolj*, *Hunedoara* and *Vâlcea*.

At the 2002 census, *females* were dominant in number, whereas the previous census had found 4 territorial districts of male dominant numbers – *Alba*, *Galați*, *Harghita* and *Tulcea*. As for larger *development regions*, the population dynamic recorded the specific trends developed in district areas, as by components. Finally, as totalising for the whole countryside, the population decreasing was dominant, the highest decreasing rate was 7.3%, for the West part of the country, and the lowest decrease rate was 2.1%, for the North-East part.

The *ageing index* was indicating, at the 2002 census, an imbalance of the demographic picture – meaning *old people more than young people* – in the district of *Teleorman* (1,320 people of 65 years old and over for every 1,000 people under 15 years), *Bucharest Municipality* (the same for 1,092 old people), *Giurgiu* (1,089) and *Buzău* (1,015). Still high ageing indexes were for districts of *Dolj* (971), *Mehedinți* (929), *Brăila* (923), *Cluj* (922), *Vâlcea* (915) and *Olt* (904). As for larger development regions, the ageing index was influenced by the territorial districts, as components, specificities. The top-3 was: (1) *Bucharest* (1,037), (2) *South* (914) and (3) *South-West* (885).

The highest population *activity rate*¹, in 2002, was recorded in districts like *Bistrița-Năsăud* (50.0%), *Bacău* (46.8%), *Botoșani* (46.8%), *Dâmbovița* (46.4%) and *Timiș*

¹ **Activity rate** = weight of the active (age) population in the total population. Calculus was for the higher than 15 year age and the up limit of the active age population.



(45.7%), and these districts had equally the highest employment rates ¹ (42.1-46.1%). Dâmbovița and Bistrița-Năsăud were the only districts where the activity rates were higher in 2002 than in 1992. At the other extreme, the lowest activity rates were in the districts of *Ialomița, Giugiu, Ilfov, Buzău, Mureș* and *Arad*, where the active population was about one third of the total, at the latest census. In 2002, the districts with the highest unemployment rates – once and a half of the whole country average rate – were *Buzău, Ialomița, Prahova, Călărași, Covasna* and *Tulcea*. As for larger development regions, in 2002 the *North-East* region had the highest activity rate, the *Bucharest* region had the highest employment rate and the *South-East* region had the most frequent unemployment for the active population.

All the regions and territorial districts recorded *decreases in the employment of the work force resources*, in 2002, as compared to 1992, as between 13.3% (*South-West*) and 8.1% (*North-West*). This was concomitant with an increase in the work force reserves in the total resources in the same regions. The highest employment rates of the work force of every region in part belong to *North-East* (66.2% in 1992; 56.3% in 2002); the lowest ones belong to *West* (60.7% in 1992) and *South* (50.5%, in 2002) and *Center* (50.0%, in 2002). In the total of the region-wide recorded work force reserves, the latest two censuses recorded the highest unemployment rates in *North-East* (20.1% in 1992 and 14.8% in 2002) and the lowest in *Bucharest* (11.9% in 1992 and 8.3% in 2002).

In 4 of the total of 8 large development regions, the *absolute numbers of unemployed people* were higher in 2002 than in 1992. As compared to the previous census, the *South* region recorded a plus of 39 thousand unemployed, which caused the highest unemployed people ratio in the total of unemployed people of 18.6%. *South* was followed by *Centre*, with an increase of 23 thousand unemployed, and by *West*, where the total number of unemployed people in 2002 was just 3 thousand higher than in 1992. In 2002, in 6 larger development regions, the *females' ratio* in the total work force resources was higher than the one of *males*, whereas males were dominant in the total unemployed number only in *South* and *South-West* (50.1%). The *North-East* country region was recording the highest *number of unemployed persons*, 167 thousand (as high as 19.3% of the total number of unemployed people in Romania), at the 1992 census. The second region in such an order was *South*, with 129 thousand of unemployed people (14.9% of the total). Ten years later, although the number of unemployed was higher in *South* and lower in *North-East* these two regions were still keeping the highest weights in the total number of unemployed people (18.6% for *South* and 17.8% for *North-East*). The lowest number of *unemployed people* was recorded, in both 1992 and 2002, in *Bucharest* (8.1% of the total number of unemployed in 1992; 7.0% of the total number of unemployed in 2002). As compared to 1992, in 2002 the total number of males unemployed rose in all regions, except for *North-West*, whereas the total number of females unemployed decreased all over, except for *Centre* region.

¹ **Employment rate** = weight of the employed population in the total population. Calculus was for the higher than 15 year age population, the up limit of active age population and the work force resources.



The *unemployed people's ratio* in the total, by territorial districts, obviously varies by both residence areas and gender. The district of *Prahova* is the one in which the number of unemployed people increased on the largest scale within the 1992-2002 interval (14 thousand more unemployed people in the urban areas and 13 thousand more unemployed people in the rural areas). The opposite case is *Satu-Mare* district, in which the total number of unemployed people even decreased by nearly 4 thousand in the urban areas and by nearly 8 thousand in the rural areas.

The lowest *rate of the inactive work force reserves* in the total of such reserves was recorded, in 1992, in the district of *Vaslui* (75.0%), and in 2002 in the one of *Botoșani* (88.9%). The opposite was, in 1992, for *Hunedoara* (88.9%), and in 2002 for *Satu-Mare* (93.6%). Whether in 1992 the *rates of the inactive work force* were in 21 districts lower than the country-wide average (84.8%), ten years later, in 8 of these districts such weights were getting higher than the country-wide average, while the rest of 13 were still keeping lower rates. As for the latest census, there were 9 more districts of such low rates. In the total of *inactive work force reserves*, the highest ratios of students were recorded by territorial districts with traditional universities, namely *Iași* (38.0% in 1992 and 33.8% in 2002), *Bucharest Municipality* (31.3% and 35.7%, respectively) and *Cluj* (30.9% and 33.8%, respectively), and the lowest ratios were recorded in *Giurgiu* (13.8% and 12.8%, respectively).

In the *active age population* of every territorial district, the lowest ratio of university graduates, higher and secondary schools and post-secondary skill-level schools were in the district of *Giurgiu*, in both 1992 and 2002 (30.4% in 1992 and 40.3% in 2002). At the other extreme, the highest graduated ratios in the active age population were in the *Bucharest Municipality* (66.5% in 1992; 74.0% in 2002), followed by *Brașov*, *Cluj*, *Sibiu* and *Timiș* (57.0-51.6% in 1992; 66.1-60.7% in 2002). On the contrary, the *retired people* keep important ratios in the total of inactive work force reserves, as variable by regions, in 2002, as between 33.8%, in *South-East*, and 41.8%, in *North-West*. As compared to 1992, these ratios have got lower country-wide, except for the North-West region.

Generally speaking, the *students' ratio in the total* of the inactive work force reserves rose, by regions, on an interval of 21.8% (*South*) and 33.2% (*Bucharest*). The housekeeping (domestic) persons also keep important ratios in the structure of the work force reserves, as: 16% (*Bucharest*), 21.0% (*North-West*) and 32.2% (*South-East*). As compared to 1992, all territorial districts and large development regions recorded growth in the ratio of *persons graduated* at least by one superior (post-secondary) school – the highest ratio was in the *Gorj* district (from 48.3% in 1992 to 61.6% in 2002). Such growth rates of 10 and more percentage points were also recorded in other 26 district areas. Finally, more than one third of district areas have recorded growths in this ratio at the two last successive censuses. This is rather the same on larger regions: the ratio of persons between 15 and 64 years of age graduated from universities and higher schools increased. The highest ratios for both 1992 and 2002 were in the *Bucharest* region (62.9% in 1992 and 70.9% in 2002) and the *Center* (50.3% in 1992 and 60.8% in 2002), and the lowest ones in *North-East* (42.1% in 1992 and 50.8% in 2002). As compared to the previous census, in 2002 *the*



Social Development Aspects by Regional Level in Romania

South-West region recorded the highest rise of this kind (from 45.9% to 58.2%), followed by *South* (from 42.9% to 54.3%).

Data provided by the censuses of 1992 and 2002 indicate interesting aspects regarding the evolution in territorial districts of the number and ratio of 15-64 years old persons continuing their individual education. So, in 1992 the weight of persons attending a high level education institution course was less than 10% in half of the districts. The rest of 20 territorial districts, including the Bucharest Municipality, recorded the corresponding ratio between 10.7% (districts of Ialomița, Caraș-Severin and Maramureș) 38.4% (the district of Timiș) and 41.7% (the Bucharest Municipality). As compared to 1992, in 2002 the country's territorial districts has seen an increase in both absolute number and ratio of persons attending such an institution courses.

The private education institutions network, plus the ones based outside the traditional university centres, essentially contributed to this progress. The highest ratio increases were recorded by the districts of Sibiu (24.3 percentage points), Bihor (23.3 points), Constanța (22.9 points), Arad (20.7 points) and Argeș (20.4 points), and the lowest ones by Vaslui (4.7 points) and Botoșani (4.3 points), whereas other seven districts recorded increases of less than 10 points.

Whereas at the country level the ratio of persons attending courses of a post-secondary school or of a school for foremans also rose, this dynamics is not similar to all districts. Three of them decreased: see Tulcea from 3.7% to 1.9%, Constanța from 2.8% to 2.4%, and Alba from 3.1% to 2.9%. The highest increases of such a ratio were in districts of: Buzău, Prahova and Mehedinți (between 3.9 and 3.2 percentage points). The opposite was for 16 other districts, plus Bucharest Municipality, recording less than one percentage point increase each.

As compared to 1992, the 2002 census results show a reduction in all districts of the number of persons attending a secondary or a basic professional school (here including schools for apprentices). In larger development regions, the number of persons attending higher education programmes rose by 2.9 times in South-West, by 2.8 times in South-East and Centre, by 2.6 times in South and North-West, and by 2.2 times in West. The lowest increase was by 1.9 times and belongs to North-East and Bucharest.

As compared to 1992, in 2002 the ratio of active age persons attending a higher education institution course rised by 17.8 percentage points in the Centre region, by 17.0 points in North-West, by 15.7 points in South-West and by 15.1 points in South-East. The lowest rise of this ratio was 8.9 percentage points and belongs to North-East.

2. Poverty

The phenomena of deepening and extending the **poverty** inside the groups of population are much larger in Romania than in other European countries and cause social exclusion, pathology and confusion (Table 1).



Table 1

The poverty in some OECD member and East European countries

Country	score	Probability of not getting to 60 years of age (% of quartiles) in the interval 2000-2005	Under the poverty threshold population (%)	
			50% of the average income in 1999, or 2000	4\$ a day in one of the years 1996-2000
Norway	1	8.4	6.4	...
Canada	5	8.1	12.8	...
Sweden	6	7.8	9.3	...
US	17	11.8	17.0	...
Japan	12	7.1	11.8	...
UK	15	8.7	12.5	...
Czech Republic	31	12.1	4.9	...
Poland	36	15.1	8.6	10
Bulgaria	55	16.6	...	22
Romania	64	19.0	8.1	23

Source: Human Development Report 2005, UNDP.

After 16 years of economic transition in Romania, *the impact of the absolute and relative poverty is much higher than in the other Central and Eastern European countries*. After 2000, the Romanian population had about 79 euro for a household, as the average income – nine times lower than the average of the rest of the 28 EU member and candidate countries. Fathey & Alber (2004) also calculated, on a 7 goods example, a *depriving degree*, which was the highest in Romania (2.96), as compared to the 13 EU candidate countries (2.06, on the average) after 1990 and the EU member countries before 2000 (0.64, on the average).

The *social protection system* was less effective than in the people expectations and even less than the minimum of social rationality, mostly ensuring the lower limit of social survival. In the nineties, as well as currently, the people's incomes were also much more differentiated in Romania than in the EU candidate and member countries. In 2003, for instance, the 1st *quartile* had only 8.1% of the total of income, whereas the last *quartile* had 48.8% of this. As on the European side, only the UK and Ireland meet such polarised incomes.

3. Other social indicators

The transition to the market economy has also induced important changes in a series of *social indicators*, as shown below. As for a country *comparison in the area*, one should note the plus of vulnerability for Romania, so the need of social policies.

The economic changes after 1989 in Romania affected the *human resources*, in the first place, foreseeing a threat to the next future demographic landscape. For instance, in the opinion of the "UN Fund for Population", Romania will have only 16 million



Social Development Aspects by Regional Level in Romania

inhabitants in 2050, of whom more than one half will be over 60 years old. Romania has to fight such a perspective by restructuring its *healthcare system, the system of education* and the one of *social insurance*.

On the basis of several studies performed in the area, the experts found that Romania's population decreased by about one million between 1992 and 2005, and this trend goes on. The *female fertility* is as low as 1.3 children to one woman, whereas the minimum necessary number to replace the lost population and the high emigration is 2.1 children to one woman. Nearly 2 million Romanians are presently abroad under legal arrangements, whereas the country's *illegal emigration* is unknown.

21.6 million inhabitants, of whom 10.5 million are adults, form Romania's present population. 5 million of this are *young* and 6 million are *old citizens*. Studies indicate that 50 years from now on the old people will be more than one half of the total population and the adults and children will be less than that. Romania is forced to reform its healthcare, education and social insurance systems, in order to fight all these.

From 2007 on Romania's *labour market* will have the less numerous age groups and the employment won't get much higher than currently, even assuming a constant economic growth, as the "Green Book" also indicates. Employing *immigrants* will be compulsory in 5-6 years, when the young work force will contain higher numbers of students, so higher ratios of people moving abroad for higher payment jobs. As a result of the labour supply shortages, about 9 billion euros of structural funds from the EU would fail from their use, in Romania. Some measures are recommended by specialists in order to improve such a direction: extending the individual activity time, therefore a higher age of retiring; the unemployed and village people retrieval in industries; laws and facilities insured for young parents, as for their work timetable, housing and more kindergartens for children.

4. Some Government undertakings

In order to resolve the social problems, with the support of the "UN Program for Development" – see the Nise Conference of 2000 –, the Romanian Government elaborated the "Anti-Poverty and Promoting Social Inclusion Programme". The Romanian Government will so develop a 59 million euros Project of *financing the social inclusion*. More than 47 million euros of this will be borrowed from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) up to the end of this 2006.

The rest of the total amount will come from the state budget (12 million of euros) and the local communities (0.725 million euros). The project will be deployed on a five year time interval, the 1st of March 2011 being the explicit IBRD lend deadline. The project of social inclusion of vulnerable groups works on *four priority directions*.

(i) The first direction (programme component) in such an order would be financed by an amount of 11.7 million euros from the same IBRD credit. It comprises some direct and urgent interventions, such as: inside the Roma community, upon the community



infrastructure, in the sense of social services performance, as well as technical assistance achieving and training for all these actions. This programme component will be managed by the “Romanian Fund for Social Development”.

(ii) The second direction will be financed by an amount of 6.1 million euros, coming from the same IBRD lending, and refers to the early education. The Ministry of Education and Research assigned shall implement it and targets rehabilitation, consolidation, extension and equipment by school devices of a number of 70 nurseries and kindergartens located in the areas mostly inhabited by Roma communities.

(iii) The third component of this programme will actually cover three other programmes in the social protection activity area: for persons with disabilities, young people of 18 years over or more who leave the institutionalized centres and the victims of domestic violence. This programme component is supposed to be financed by an amount of 28.6 million euros and managed by the Ministry of Labour, Social Solidarity and Family. The amounts will be provided for new buildings for housing such vulnerable groups, special equipment, personnel training, advertising, preparing and sustaining an information release, education and communication strategy.

(iv) The fourth and last programme component of this project aims at the institutional development capacity of the “National Agency for Roma People” (NARP) to evaluate and monitor projects for this ethnic population, their effects and future ways of action. These actions will be coordinated by the Ministry of Labour, Social Solidarity and Family and the total amount of financing will be 0.8 million euros.

The whole credit has a 17 years term and contains a non-payment period of 5 years. The amounts needed to reimburse it, plus the afferent interests and commissions, and the Romania’s contribution to this project will be ensured by the State budget, through the budgets of the Ministry of Public Finance, Ministry of Economy and Trade and Ministry of Labour, Solidarity and Family.

This action is based on the recommendations made on the above described document of the “National Anti-poverty and Social Inclusion Promotion Plan”. This document points out the special significance of the increase of social spending weight in GDP to 25% and draws the main lines of acting for draining the social landscape:

- the need for increasing the weight of active programmes for employment and extension of the social economy;
- progressive giving up of the social programmes breaking up;
- improving all services performances and qualities, here including minimal quality standards and a quality monitoring system;
- drastically reducing the too expensive and low returns social programmes.



Bibliography

- Alber J., Fahey T., 2004: Perception of living condition in an enlarged Europe, European Commission.
- Barr N(editor), Labor markets and social Policy in Central and Eastern Europe. The Transition and Beyond Oxford University press, 1994; and 2004 edition.
- Brănzan, O., 2003, "The reform of health care systems in Europe: reconciling equity", quality and efficiency, Doc.9903, Parliamentary Assembly, Council of Europe
- Cace S. Vlădescu C., 2004, Starea de sănătate a populației roma și accesul la serviciile de sănătate, Ed.Expert 2004.
- Cace S. Vlădescu C. (coord.), 2004, "Accesul populației roma la serviciile de sănătate", Jurnalul practicilor pozitive comunitare, nr.3-4.
- Calculus Center of Sanitary Statistics 2005: Anuarul de Statistică Sanitară 2004.
- CEDEFOP (2003): "Learning for employment". Second report on vocational education and training policy in Europe, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 2003.
- Comission Europeéne: La protection sociale en Europe 1999, 2000.
- Council of Europe: The European Social Charter, Strasbourg, 1992.
- Constantin Grigorescu, Maria Poenaru, Maria Molnar, "Dimensiunea socială a Uniunii Europene", pag. 210, Oeconomica, 2002.
- European Commission (2003): "European Report on Quality Indicators of Lifelong Learning – Fifteen Quality Indicators", Brussels, June.
- European Commission (2004): "Investing in people. The European Social Fund, 2000 – 2006, Employment and Social Affairs", Luxembourg.
- European Commission (2006): "Joint Report on Social Protection and Social Inclusion 2006", EC Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affaires and Equal Opportunities, April 2006.
- Ghebrea, G.- Social Dialogue in Romania-from a forgotten tradition to a renewed practice, South-East Europe Review no. 3/2005.
- Hantrais L. Social policy in the European Union, second edition, Macmillan Press Ltd.,2000.
- Idu N., Mocanu O., Voicu A., "Stadiul negocierilor in vederea aderarii la Uniunea Europeana a statelor candidate din Europa Centrala si de Est . Analize comparative", Oeconomica, 4(1), 2001.
- Lambro M., Chirițoiu B., Gregoier G., 2003, Sistemul românesc de asigurări sociale și aderarea la Uniunea Europeană, I.E.R.
- Mărginean I. (coord.), 2003, Calitatea vieții în România 1990 – 2003, Raport de cercetare ICCV – Decembrie.

- National Institute of Statistics 2002: Analize demografice. Situația demografică a României în anul 2001, p.18.
- National Institute of Statistics 1990 – 2005: Anuarul Statistic al României, București 2006.
- National Institute of Statistics: Starea socială și economică a României în anii 2003-2004 (Rom// The Social and Economic Situation of Romania in 2003-2004). Bucharest 2006.
- National Institute of Statistics 2002: Statistică teritorială.
- National Institute of Statistics: Structura resurselor de munca la recensamintele din 1992 și 2002 (Rom// Structure of workforce resources, revealed by the censuses of 1992 and 2002), Bucharest, 2005.
- National Institute of Statistics: Tendințe sociale (Rom// Social Tendencies), Bucharest 2005.
- Panduru F., Porojan D., 2001, Starea de sănătate a populației din România, INS
- Păuna, Carmen, Modelul German al Economiei de piață, Editura Niculescu, București, 2000.
- Pavelescu, F., Transformarea economiei și dezechilibrele pieței forței de muncă Editura I.R.L.I. Bucuresti 2003.
- Perț, Steliana, Vasile Valentina, (2004), "Investiția în Resursa Umană – Prioritate a Dezvoltării Durabile. Parteneriatul Public Privat", Comunicare prezentată la Conferința CCIRMB, decembrie, București.
- Perț, Steliana, Vasile Valentina, (2005): "Performanță și Contraperformanță în Educația Permanentă din Perspectiva Cerințelor Strategiei Lisabona", în Economia Românească în contextul Integrării Europene, Editura Junimea, Iași.
- Regional Office For Europe, 1996, European Health Care Reforms: Analysis of Current Strategies, Summary, 23 April, WHO.
- Ristea, A.L., Stegăroiu I., 2006, Diagnosticarea sistemului de finanțare, producție și distribuție a serviciilor de sănătate în unele țări europene, CIDE, INCE, Academia Română.
- Scicluna, H., 1998, Critical challenges for health care reform in Europe, Open University Press: Buckingham, Saltman, Richard B.; Figueras, Josep; Sakellarides, Constantino, editors.
- Watkins, K., 2005, Priorities in public spending, Human Development Report 2005, International cooperation at a crossroads : Aid, trade and security in an unequal world, UNDP.
- Zamfir, C, Zamfir E., (coord.), 1995, Politici sociale România în context european, Ed.Alternative, București.
- Zamfir, C., Preda M., coord., 2002, Romii în România, Ed.Expert, București.
- Zamfir, C., Stoica L.(coord.), 2006, "Dezvoltarea socială :câteva elemente teoretice", in O nouă provocare : Dezvoltarea socială, Collegium, Ed.Polirom.



Social Development Aspects by Regional Level in Romani

- xxx 2001: A decade of transition, UNICEF, Florența.
- xxx 2002, "Barometrul de opinie privind serviciile de sanatate, Metro Media Transilvania", www.mmt.ro .
- xxx 2003, Calitatea vieții în România 1990 – 2003, Raport de cercetare ICCV – Decembrie 2003, coord.l.Mărginean.
- xxx 2003, Carta reformei serviciilor de sănătate din România, Ministerul Sănătății și Familiei, www.msf.ro.
- XXX "Draft Joint Report on Social Inclusion", Communication from the Commission to the Council , The European Parliament , The Economic and Social Committee and The Committee of the Regions, 2000.
- xxx, 2005, "Recommendations for Health Services and the Internal Market", EHPP, EU Health Policy Forum.
- xxx, 2005, The European Health Report, Public health action for healthier children and populations, WHO.



Table Key Social Indicators

	<i>GNI per capita</i>	<i>Life Expectancy</i>		<i>Infant Mortality</i>		<i>Literacy Rate (Adult)</i>			<i>Literacy Rate (Youth)</i>		
	2003	1990	2002	1990	2002	1990	2000	2002	1990	2000	2002
Romania	2,310	69.7	70.0	27.0	19.0	97.1	97.1	97.3	99.3	99.6	97.8
Bulgaria	2,130	71.4	71.8	14.0	14.0	97.2	97.2	98.6	99.4	99J	99.7
Croatia	5,350	72.2	73.8	12.0	7.0	96.9	96.9		99.6	99.8	99.6
Czech Republic	6,740	71.7	75.0	10.0	4.0						
Estonia	4,960	69.5	70.6	15.0	10.0	99.8	99.8		99.8	99.8	
Hungary	6,330	69.3	72.3	15.0	8.0	99.1	99.1	99.4	99.7	99.8	99.8
Latvia	4,070	69.3	70.4	16.0	17.0	99.8	99.7		99.8	99.8	
Lithuania /:	4,490	71.3	72.7	17.0	8.0	99.3	99.6		99.8	99.8	
Poland	5,270	70.9	73.8	16.0	8.0						
Slovak Republic	4,920	70.9	73.3	14.0	8.0				99.6		
Slovenia	11,830	73.3	75.9	8.0	4.0	99.6	99.6	99.7	99.8	99.8	99.8
ECA	2,570	69.3	68.6	37.3	30.7	96.0	96.0		98.3	98.9	98.9
Lower-Middle Income	1,480	67.4	69.1	43.5	32.1	80.7	80.7		93.5	96.8	

	Net Enrollment In Primary		HDI			
	1990	2000	1990	1995	2000	2002
Romania		92.8	0.771	0.769	0.773	0.778
Bulgaria	86.1	92.7	0.795	0.784	0.791	0.796
Croatia	78.8	88.2	0.806	0.798	0.823	0.830
Czech Republic		90.3		0.843	0.856	0.868
Estonia		97.6	0.817	0.796	0.839	0.853
Hungary	91.3	89.9	0.807	0.810	0.837	0.848
Latvia		90.6	0.807	0.765	0.808	0.823
Lithuania		97.5	0.823	0.789	0.829	0.842
Poland	96.6	97.7	0.802	0.816	0.843	0.850
Slovak Republic		89.4				0.842
Slovenia	..	93.4		0.852	0.883	0.893
ECA	..					0.796
Lower-Middle Income	95.1	91.3				0.756

Note: HDI - Human Development Index.

Source: WB Database and HDI from UNDP Human Development Report 2004.

Annex 2

Financing public expenditure and services in Romania

= % of GDP =

		1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Public social expenditure	% of GDP	14.2	16.6	17.0	16.5	15.2	15.5	16.0	15.7	15.9	17.3	18.4	17.2	18.2	18.1	18.4	19.4
Healthcare expenditure	% of GDP	2.5	2.8	3.3	3.1	2.8	2.9	2.6	2.8	2.6	3.5	3.8	3.7*	4.0*	4	4.1	3.8
Educational expenditure	% of GDP	2.2	2.8	3.6	3.6	3.3	3.1	3.4	3.6	3.3	3.3	3.8	3.1*	3.2	3.6	3.9	4.1
Expenditure on social assistance, allocations, pensions and allowances	% of GDP		3.2	1.9	1.6	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.4	1.8	1.8	1.7	1.9	2.0	2.6	2.8	2.9
Expenditure on pensions	% of GDP		6.9	7.0	6.7	5.9	5.5	5.7	5.5	5.1	6.9	7.0	6.8	6.9	6.9	6.1	6.4
Expenditure on social assistance pensions	% of GDP		3.6	5.4	5.3	5.2	4.9	5.1	5.1	4.6	5.9	6.1	5.9	6.1	6.4	5.7	5.8
Expenditure on unemployment	% of GDP			0.31	0.74	0.89	0.97	0.99	0.69	1.27	1.43	1.52	1.16	0.81	0.75	0.74	0.67
of which: - expenditure for passive measures	% of the unempl. exp.			61.8	78.8	88.7	83.8	73.8	58.6	29.3	38.1	43.2	39.3	46.9	51.0	46.7	53.1
expenditure for active measures	% of the unempl. exp.			38.2	21.2	11.3	16.2	26.2	41.4	70.7	61.9	56.8	60.7	53.1	49.0	53.3	46.9
Defense expenditure	% of GDP		2.2	4.4	4.2	3.2	3.7	3.4	3.4	3.0	3.2	2.9	3.5	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.1

Calculated on data from the National Institute of Statistics*, Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family and the Institute for the Life Quality Studies

Mariana Stanciu: *Modelul Social European* (Implications for Romania// "The Social European Model") Study undertaken in 2006 under the "European Institute of Romania".

Romania Key Economic and Social Indicators, 1990-2003

Series Name	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Average	Europe & C. Asia	Lower Middle	Bulgaria	Croatia	Poland	Slovak Rep.
GDP growth (annual %)	(5.6)	(12.9)	(8.8)	1.5	4.0	7.2	4.0	(6.1)	(4.8)	(1.2)	0.6	5.3	4.3	7.6	(0.3)	(0.3)	3.2	(0.8)	1.7	4.7	1.8
GDP per capita growth (annual %)	(5.8)	(12.8)	(7.3)	1.7	4.1	7.4	4.3	(5.9)	(4.6)	(1.0)	0.7	5.4	7.2	5.6	0.0	(0.3)	1.9	(0.0)	2.1	4.6	2.3
GNI per capita, PPP (current international \$)	5,340	4,830	4,590	4,780	5,070	5,570	5,920	5,680	5,490	5,520	5,670	6,120	6,490	7,140	5,586	5,870	3,911	5,766	7,807	7,954	9,893
GNI per capita, Atlas Method (current US\$)	1,730	1,430	1,240	1,190	1,270	1,470	1,600	1,520	1,520	1,580	1,680	1,720	1,920	2,310	1,584	2,150	1,246	1,536	4,108	3,691	3,466
Agriculture, value added (% of GDP)	23.7	20.1	19.4	22.6	21.5	21.4	20.6	19.6	16.2	15.2	12.5	14.8	13.1	11.9	18.0	11.4	13.1	15.6	10.6	5.4	5.1
Industry, value added (% of GDP)	49.9	45.1	44.0	42.1	46.3	42.7	42.5	39.2	35.4	33.9	36.4	37.0	38.1	36.1	40.6	36.4	37.8	34.3	32.7	37.8	36.3
Services, etc., value added (% of GDP)	26.3	34.8	36.6	35.3	32.2	35.8	37.0	41.2	48.4	51.0	51.1	48.1	48.8	52.0	41.3	52.2	49.2	50.1	56.7	56.7	58.6
Exports of goods and services (% of GDP)	16.7	17.6	27.8	23.0	24.9	27.6	28.1	29.2	22.6	28.0	32.9	33.3	35.4	33.0	27.2	34.1	23.9	48.2	48.1	25.1	60.3
Imports of goods and services (% of GDP)	26.2	21.5	36.2	28.0	27.0	33.2	36.6	36.2	30.6	32.9	38.5	41.1	41.2	38.5	33.4	33.2	23.2	50.9	54.5	26.8	65.0
Current account balance (% of GDP)	(8.5)	(3.5)	(6.0)	(4.5)	(1.4)	(5.0)	(7.3)	(6.0)	(6.9)	(3.6)	(3.7)	(5.5)	(3.3)	..	(5.0)	-	-	(3.5)	(4.9)	(2.3)	(4.5)
Total debt service (% of exports of goods and services)	0.3	2.4	9.1	6.3	8.6	10.5	46.8	32.6	24.6	36.7	19.2	18.3	18.6	..	18.0	16.2	20.1	14.7	16.1	12.6	14.1
External debt (% of GNI)	3.0	7.5	13.1	16.3	18.8	19.3	23.9	27.2	23.8	26.0	28.6	28.9	32.4	..	20.7	39.0	42.0	93.5	41.1	45.3	46.3
Total reserves in months of imports	1.7	2.8	2.9	3.2	4.6	2.7	2.9	4.4	3.4	3.7	4.0	4.4	5.1	5.8	3.7	3.9	6.5	4.0	3.4	4.3	3.5
Current revenue, excluding grants (% of GDP)	34.4	35.8	36.1	31.9	29.9	29.5	27.6	26.1	27.8	30.3	29.5	26.7	30.5	24.2	15.9	35.3	40.4	22.6	35.9
Current expenditure, total (% of GDP)	27.9	31.4	36.5	28.3	27.7	27.8	28.7	30.3	32.3	30.5	26.8	29.7	-	-	38.1	39.6	23.5	34.8
Overall budget balance, excluding capital grants (% of GDP)	0.9	1.9	(4.7)	(0.5)	(2.5)	(3.0)	(4.0)	(3.9)	(3.1)	(1.8)	(4.0)	(3.1)	(2.3)	-	-	(3.9)	(1.8)	(1.1)	(3.1)
Gross domestic savings (% of GDP)	20.8	24.1	23.0	24.0	22.7	18.7	17.4	13.6	9.7	11.2	13.8	14.8	17.3	15.3	17.6	24.5	26.9	14.5	10.8	19.1	24.2
Inflation, consumer prices (annual %)	..	230.6	211.2	255.2	136.8	32.2	38.8	154.8	59.1	45.8	45.7	34.5	22.5	15.3	98.6	-	-	136.5	206.3	60.6	8.4
Literacy rate, adult total (% of people ages 15 and above)	97.1	97.2	97.3	97.4	97.5	97.6	97.7	97.8	97.9	98.0	98.1	98.2	97.3	..	97.6	96.5	84.0	97.9	97.7	-	99.7
Immunization, DPT (% of children ages 12-23 months)	96.0	98.0	98.0	91.0	98.0	98.0	98.0	97.0	97.0	97.0	99.0	99.0	99.0	..	97.3	88.9	86.4	95.7	90.5	96.8	99.0
Improved water source (% of population with access)	58.0	58.0	90.9	77.8	100.0	-	-	100.0
Improved sanitation facilities (% of population with access)	53.0	-	-	51.9	100.0	-	-	100.0
Life expectancy at birth, total (years)	69.7	69.8	69.8	69.6	69.5	69.5	69.1	69.0	69.3	69.8	69.9	..	70.0	..	69.6	68.6	68.2	71.2	72.5	72.1	72.3
Mortality rate, Infant (per 1,000 live births)	27.0	21.0	19.0	..	19.0	..	21.5	33.8	37.5	14.8	9.3	11.8	10.3
School enrollment, preprimary (% gross)	74.6	74.1	74.3	51.8	52.0	52.3	52.6	54.6	61.8	68.0	72.8	62.6	55.1	32.2	68.6	33.7	46.3	76.6
School enrollment, primary (% gross)	91.3	88.4	86.5	87.5	94.6	99.9	103.5	104.9	104.3	102.1	98.8	96.5	99.3	113.0	97.4	89.3	98.9	101.5
School enrollment, secondary (% gross)	92.0	85.9	82.6	79.4	77.8	77.9	78.4	78.7	78.9	80.2	82.3	81.3	84.2	63.1	81.0	82.3	93.1	88.0
Population growth (annual %)	0.2	(0.1)	(1.7)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.2)	(0.3)	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.5)	(0.4)	(0.3)	(0.8)	(0.7)	(0.8)	(0.5)	0.1	0.2
Population, total	23.2	23.2	22.8	22.8	22.7	22.6	22.6	22.5	22.5	22.4	22.4	22.3	22.2	22.6	472.2	2,491.7	8.3	4.6	38.5	5.4	
Urban population (% of total)	53.2	53.5	53.9	54.2	54.6	54.9	54.8	54.8	54.7	54.7	54.6	54.6	54.6	54.7	54.4	63.1	45.4	68.1	56.4	61.4	56.8

Source: WB Database December 22, 2004.