Social Security: Equity and Cost Optimization

Bernard Dussault

March 2, 2001 Conference on Social Security Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de Mexico (ITAM)

Most common types of

GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK

for Social Security Programs

Public systems

 Defined Benefit
 Paygo financing
 Centralized administration

Private systems

- **O Defined Contribution**
- Full funding
- Fragmented pools (financial institutions)

Overall ADMINISTRATIVE CHARGES as a % of contributions

Centralized Administration OASDI (United States): 1% CPP (Canada excl. Quebec): 1.3% QPP (Quebec): 1.5%

- Fragmented Pools
 - **OUK: 40%**
 - o Latin American (7): 42%
 - Difference due to
 - scale of operations
 - transfers
 - profit margins
 - abuses

INTERNAL RATE OF RETURN

1. **GROSS** (before administrative charges)

(a) PAYGO: economic growth e = (1+p)*(1+s) - 1 = -0.2% + 4% = 3.8% p=demographic increase s = increase in average covered earnings
(b) FUNDING: yield on assets
Diversified portfolio i = ((1+k)*(1+t)-1)/(1-x) = ((1.03)*(1.01)-1)/(1-0.4243) = 7.0% Government bonds i = 6%

2. Net (after administration charges) e (public) = 3.8% - 0.13% = 3.67% i (priv.div.portf.) = 7.0% - 1.56% = 5.44% i (pub.gov.bonds) = 6.0% i (pub.div.portfolio.) = 7.0%

FUNDING compared to PAYGO

- Higher IRR ==> lower cont. rate (CR)
- If paygo===funding, why not FUNDING?
 Higher take-home pay
 Better compliance with the system
- Equity: intra and inter-generational
- Entitlement based on ownership
- CR not affected by fertility-related aging
- Lower volatility of CR from year to year via larger cushion provided by the fund

CONCLUSION

The best of two worlds

┿

1. Centralized administration of publicly sponsored programs



3. A FUNDED (diversified portfolio) PUBLIC program ... DB or DC

Funding Issues

1. Investment risk

- higher in developing countries
- likely the same at the private and public levels
- if government cannot be trusted for managing investments, can it be trusted for supervising private financial private institutions?
- are gov. bonds more productive?
- control mechanisms: CPP & QPP
- 2. Role of funded social security on economic growth: catalyst
- 3. From paygo to funding:
 - transition costs
 - opportunity for fuller funding: CPP, QPP
- 4. Defined Benefit versus Defined Contribution: not an issue

Effect of AGING on PENSION COSTS

1. Lower FERTILITY



2. Lower MORTALITY

annual decline over 100 years	Canadian (1991 CLT) unisex life expectancy at age 65
0.00%	18.12 (100%)
0.75%	24.47 (135%)
1.50%	26.77 (147%)

Correlation between assumptions (continued)

- Productivity increases longevity,
 i.e. induces aging:

 20th century experience
 (GDP,longevity)
 lower mortality of higher earners
 Recessions
 =higher umemployent rate
 =higher incidence of disability
 =higher mortality
- Productivity decreases with aging
- These two apparently contradicting theories might indicate that there is a limit to aging or to productivity or to both, or that the pace of both factors can only shrink as they increase.

Correlation between assumptions (continued)

Real return on assets > Productivity grossed-up for taxes i_r > t/(1-x)

i.e. Nominal return on assets > Productivity grossed-up for inflation+ taxes i > (1+t)*(1+k)/(1-x)



Correlation between assumptions (continued)

		experienc
	Canadian e	
	44-year	20-year
	averages	averages
	(1953-	(1977-
	1997)	1997)
Average increase in total population (p)	1.54%	1.18%
Average nominal increase in GDP (e)	8.18%	7.06%
Average inflation (k)	4.21%	4.87%
Average real rate of increase in GDP (e r	3.81%	2.09%
=((1+e)/(1+k))-1)		
Residual productivity $(t=((1+e_r)/(1+p))-1)$	2.23%	0.90%
Nominal wage increase s=((1+t)*(1+k))-1	6.54%	5.81%
Average gross nominal return on long-term	7.71%	12.46%
bonds (i)		
Tax rate (x)	45.0%	45.0%
Net real return ($I_{nr} = ((1+I*(1-$	0.02%	1.90%
x))/(1+k))-1)		
Average real return on bonds (I_r)	3.35%	7.24%

• The fall in demographic increase matches a fall in economic growth.

- The productivity rate gets lower with the aging of the population.
- The real return (on bonds) net of taxes is positive, though higher than productivity only for the 20-year period.

Pension Cost Formula (earnings-related retirement benefits)

CR = <u>BR*PVB(ELBP,IRR-c)</u> ACC(CP,IRR-s)

PAYGO: IRR= e = p+s CR = <u>BR*PVB(ELBP,p+s-c)</u> ACC(CP,p)

ENTRY AGE: IRR= i CR = <u>BR*PVB(ELBP,i-c)</u> ACC(CP,i-s)

The above expressions imply the return of accumulated contributions in case of death before retirement.

 CR = contribution rate

 BR = benefit rate
 c = benefit indexation rate

 CP = contributory period
 ELBP = expected length of benefit period

 i = yield o pension assets
 s = increase in average earnings
 p = demographic increase

 PVB = present value of benefits (annuity-due)
 ACC = accumulation-due of contributions

12