

SPRING 2012 REFORM BAROMETER – LITHUANIA

	<u>Level</u>			<u>Rank</u>			<u>Gap</u>		<u>Areas of Action</u>	
	2010	2011	Change	2010	2011	change	EU top 5	Gap ¹		
Pillar I	1 GDP per capita (Purchasing Power Parity- PPP)	14236	15638	9,8%	29	29	0	NL AT IE SE DK	-51%	
	2 GDP per capita (€ at 2000 prices)	6714	7266	8,2%	29	29	0	DK IE SE NL AT	-79%	
	3 Labour productivity per hour worked (PPP)	18,5	18,9	2,2%	27	27	0	NL BE FR IE DE	-58%	
	4 Labour productivity per person employed (PPP)	34849	36248	4,0%	29	29	0	IE BE AT FR NL	-48%	
	5 Private investment (excluding non residential, %GDP)	1,7	3,3	1,6	28	27	1	SK AT BE IT CZ	-5,2	
	6 Industrial activity (% total value added)	25,6	25,7	0,1	10	10	0	SK CZ IE RO HU	-4,7	
	7 R&D expenditure (% GDP) *	0,8	0,8	0,0	24	24	0	FI SE DK DE AT	-2,4	
	8 Operating surplus (% total value added)	56,0	54,1	-1,9	3	4	-1	BG GR RO LT IE	-1,1	
Pillar II	9 Current Account (% GDP)	1,1	-1,7	-2,8	14	19	-5	SE DK NL LU DE	-7,4	
	10 Export market share (gain from 2000)	75,5	81,0	5,5	1	1	0	LT RO HU BG CZ	17,8	
	11 Net export contribution to GDP	0,2	-1,1	-1,3	19	29	-10	PT IE GR SK HU	-4,2	
	12 Relative yearly gain in global trade share (% total trade)	0,05	0,13	0,1	2	2	0	EE LT LV BG CZ	0,02	
	13 Relative unit labour cost (gain from 2000)	1,0	0,5	-0,5	10	10	0	DE SE AT PL GR	7,5	
	14 High-tech exports (% total exports) **	6,5	5,8	-0,7	20	24	-4	MT LU HU IE CY	-24,2	
Pillar III	15 Employment rate (% working age population)	57,8	60,0	2,2	30	30	0	AT NL LU DE CY	-10,4	
	16 Employment rate 15-24 (% population 15-24)	19,2	19,3	0,1	31	29	2	NL DK AT DE UK	-34,0	
	17 Employment rate 55-64 (% population 55-64)	48,6	49,8	1,2	16	16	0	SE DE DK UK FI	-10,8	
	18 Annual hours worked (per capita)	1882	1915	1,7%	8	8	0	PL PT CZ GR HU	-3%	
	19 Labour participation (% working age population)	71,6	72,4	0,7	19	19	0	SE DK NL PT DE	-7,4	
	20 Working age population (as % total population)	69,3	70,1	0,8	7	4	3	SK PL CY LT RO	1,0	
	21 Unemployment rate (% labour force)	17,8	16,9	-0,9	30	30	0	AT NL LU DK MT	11,5	
Pillar IV	22 Gross debt - general government (% GDP)	38,0	37,7	-0,2	6	6	0	EE BG LU RO SE	15,1	
	23 Net debt - general government (% GDP)*	-1,6	-9,2	-7,6	5	8	-3	EE DK BG RO SE	-14,6	
	24 Government budget balance (% GDP)	-7,0	-5,0	2,1	21	19	2	HU SE EE LU FI	-3,5	
	25 Primary balance (% GDP)	-5,3	-3,1	2,2	24	22	2	HU SE DE EE IT	-5,5	
	26 Tax burden (% GDP)	27,5	27,3	0,0	4	3	1	BG LT LV RO SK	-0,6	
	27 Highest marginal tax rate, individual rate (%)	15,0	15,0	0	2	2	0	BG CZ LT RO SK	10	
	28 Public investment (% total public expenditure)	12,7	13,5	0,1	4	5	-1	RO PL BG LV LT	-1,4	
	29 Net foreign assets (% GDP) *	66,1	66,1	0,0	19	19	0	LU NL CY BE DE	141,8	
Pillar V	30 Net financial assets, households (% GDP) *	38,4	39,5	1,1	24	24	0	BE IT MT NL CY	-131,4	
	31 Net financial liabilities, non financial corporations (% GDP)*	-103,6	-94,1	9,4	13	13	0	SK DE NL GR DK	33,8	
	32 Regulatory tier 1 capital to risk weighted assets *	9,3	10,9	1,6	28	25	3	EE BE MT LU RO	-4,0	
	33 Non performing loans to total gross loans	19,3	21,1	1,8	30	27	3	FI LU SE AT BE	9,2	
	34 Loans to private sector (% GDP) *	69,1	62,4	-6,7	5	5	0	RO SK PL CZ LT	10,7	
	35 Bank liabilities (%GDP) *	95,1	91,2	-3,9	4	4	0	RO SK PL LT BG	11	

■ Five best
■ Lowest third

1. Percentage points, when not indicated otherwise

* 2009/ 2010 data
** 2008/ 2009 data

A methodological note can be found in the report or [here](#).

PRIORITIES FOR REFORM IN 2012

	I. Policy Area	II. Concrete Recommendations	III. Are the proposed recommendations already in the agenda of your Government?	
			Yes	No
Priority 1	6	Reduce costs for financing of obligations for services of public interest		X
Priority 2	13	a) Increase willingness to work instead of receive unemployment benefits by reducing the length of time unemployed workers can receive benefits; b) Implement voucher system which would enable unemployed people to get benefits for a certain work.	X	
Priority 3	1	a) Improve territorial planning procedures; b) Avoid radical and spontaneous decision making (e.g. regulations on marking of goods)		X
Priority 4	19	a) Avoid incoherent and uncoordinated decisions between Ministries and the Parliament; b) Ensure stable tax policy		X
Priority 5	23	a) Improve performance of JEREMIE schemes; b) Every particular project should be taken into account when considering lending independently of the influence of Central banks on general situation in the country.	X	

Policy areas

1. Business Environment - Regulatory barriers to entrepreneurship
2. Business Dynamics - Start-up conditions
3. R&D and Innovation
4. ICT
5. Competition policy framework
6. Sector specific regulation (telecom, energy)
7. Market integration - Openness to trade and investment
8. Active labour market policies
9. Job protection
10. Labour supply measures for specific groups (older workers, women...)
11. Wage bargaining and wage-setting policies
12. Labour market mismatch and labour mobility
13. Making work-pay: interplay of tax and benefit system
14. Pension and health care reforms
15. Quality of fiscal institutions and budgetary framework
16. Consolidation of public expenditures
17. Public sector efficiency
18. Public investment
19. Tax reforms
20. Access to bond markets
21. Access to equity markets
22. Venture capital and SME financing instruments
23. Bank lending conditions
24. Long term investment instruments

REFORM PROGRESS IN 2011

	I. Policy Area	II. Concrete Recommendations	III. Are the proposed recommendations already in the agenda of your Government?		How do you assess reform progress over the past year? (1 for excellent progress; 5 for no progress) *		Are these priorities properly identified in the National Reform Programme submitted by your government in 2011?	
			Yes	No	Comments	Rank	Yes	No
Priority 1	1	a. Reduce number of bureaucratic barriers for start-ups; b. Improve the performance of supervising authorities (business supervision measures should be more of informative and consultative nature, and less of penalty nature; business check-ups of similar nature conducted by different supervising authorities must be avoided) c. Simplify tax administration procedures for SMEs; d. Create efficient information and financial support schemes for business start ups.	X		Less bureaucratic barriers starting up a business, new juridical forms of entities have emerged, consultation seminars were held.	2	X	
Priority 2	23	a. Increase competition in financial sector; b. Improve performance of financial engineering schemes (eg. JEREMIE schemes) – simplify administrative procedures, orientate these schemes towards real business needs.		X	Only funds of Business Angels operated appropriately.	4	X	
Priority 3	15	a. Public spending decisions must be implemented through cost-benefit analysis; b. Implement structural social security, education and healthcare system reforms; c. Create long-term public finance strategy orientated towards concrete long-term fiscal goals.		X	Prolonged development and implementation of frameworks, rarely used cost-benefit analysis, but attentive fiscal deficit reduction strategy.	3		X
Priority 4	3	a. Simplify administrative procedures for European RDI programs; b. Ensure long-term stability of national RDI support programs; c. Promote RDI among businesses.	X		Administrative procedures for European RDI programs not simplified, but significant support for R&D.	2	X	
Priority 5	12	a. Create prudent labor demand forecasting mechanisms; b. Promote life-long learning among various labor market groups; c. Improve workers' retraining mechanisms, eg. implement retraining of workers through voucher systems.		X	Labor demand forecasting mechanisms stuck in the face of drafting, life-long learning promotion inefficient, labor market mismatch growing.	4	X	

* Please see list of areas on page 2 "reform priorities for 2012"

* Rank of reform progress: 1. Excellent/ no further progress needed; 2. Satisfactory; 3. Mixed; 4. Unsatisfactory; 5. No progress

REFORM PROGRESS IN OVERALL POLICY AREAS 2011

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<i>Mixed</i>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	<i>No progress</i>
Productivity and investment			X		
International competitiveness			X		
Labour market				X	
Public finances			X		
Financial stability		X			

EUROPEAN SEMESTER

1. Do you believe the European Semester will bring a real change to policy coordination in Europe?

<i>Yes, absolutely</i>	<i>To a large extent</i>	<i>To some extent</i>	<i>Not enough</i>	<i>Not at all</i>
		x		

2. Basing your analysis on the National Reform Programme submitted by your government, would you consider that it reveals a greater commitment from your country to this process?

<i>Yes, absolutely</i>	<i>To a large extent</i>	<i>To some extent</i>	<i>Not enough</i>	<i>Not at all</i>
			x	

3. Do you believe the National Reform Programme submitted by your government properly reflects the key challenges in your county?

<i>Yes, absolutely</i>	<i>To a large extent</i>	<i>To some extent</i>	<i>Not enough</i>	<i>Not at all</i>
		x		

4. The Commission's country specific recommendations for your country are:

<i>Excessively complacent</i>	<i>Slightly too positive</i>	<i>Absolutely appropriate</i>	<i>Slightly too negative</i>	<i>Excessively harsh</i>
	x			

5. Are the country-specific recommendations being properly implemented?

<i>Yes, absolutely</i>	<i>To a large extent</i>	<i>To some extent</i>	<i>Not enough</i>	<i>Not at all</i>
			x	

6. Are commitments concerning the euro plus pact properly addressed by your government in the NRP?

<i>Yes, absolutely</i>	<i>To a large extent</i>	<i>To some extent</i>	<i>Not enough</i>	<i>Not at all</i>
		x		

7. Do you believe the Commission recommendations in this area to be appropriate?

<i>Yes, absolutely</i>	<i>To a large extent</i>	<i>To some extent</i>	<i>Not enough</i>	<i>Not at all</i>
	x			