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1. Introduction

Since the Anti-Communist Revolutions, from the end of twentieth century, the Eastern Europe emergent markets are in a continuous transition process to functional market economies. Although most of these countries became members of the European Union, the capital markets regulation still remains a main issue for the capital markets development.

The Romanian experience can be interesting for at least two reasons: i) no knowledge of the market economy for a very long period of time (after 1938) and ii) no economic freedom or even relationships with the market based economies for this period. The result of this study can be useful for investors, as they will be able to find out whether their rights as minority shareholders are protected by Romanian regulators. This result might prove to be very important in the context of Romania’s accession within the European Union, with constantly growing opportunities and no barriers for capital flows within EU.

Most of the countries in transition adopted organizational structures inspired by the ones in the developed countries. Anecdotally, the Romanian over the counter market is called RASDAQ, from NASDAQ. Yet, the implementation mechanism was not always brought into practice. As a result, a heterogeneous system has been created, which gathered structures and institutions some of them typical to the market economy, others of the state-owned economy.

Historically, in December 1989, the time of the Romanian anti-communist revolution, individuals were not familiar with market economy mechanisms. This state was due to more than fifty years of a non-market economy. In fact, before the Second World War, Romania was under a royal (1938-1940) and, after that, a fascist (1940-1941) dictatorship. Between 1941 and 1945, Romania fought in the Second World War, and beginning with 1945 was under the influence of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. During this period information related to anything that was associated with the market economy doctrine was practically unavailable to the majority of the Romanian population. Moreover, maybe in connection with this state, even after 1989, the mechanisms of the market economy were not enforced soon. Hence, there is an opportunity for studying the evolution of regulations related to corporate governance, especially to minority shareholders protection in a country that had no recent history of a market economy. The results can be analysed comparatively to Gillies et al. (2002) for Estonia. However, the situation in Romania is very different relative to Estonia. For instance, if Estonia benefited from the Finnish television network from 40 miles away, Romania’s neighbours were only communist countries – USSR, Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria so these television networks were under the Communist doctrine, too.

Historically, the Romanian stock market exchange activity began in 1839, when trade markets were open. On January
1st 1882 Bucharest Stock Exchange Market (BSE) was officially opened, and after one week the stock market quotations were published in the Romanian Official Journal. During its existence the stock market’s activity was influenced by the socio-political events of the time (the 1907 revolt, the Balkan war in 1912-1913), but it was closed only during the First World War. The activity of the stock market is interrupted in 1948 following nationalization. At the moment of its closure, there were listed shares of 93 companies and 77 fixed income assets (bonds) (www.kmarket.ro, section “Documentaries”).

After a break of almost 50 years, the BSE was reopened in 1995, the first day of trading being November 20th 1995. BSE is a share-owned company and was set up by the decision of the National Securities Commission (NSC). Presently, it offers the possibility to invest in equity securities (shares and allocation rights), debt securities (municipal bonds and corporate bonds), securities issued by mutual funds (shares and fund units), and futures contracts. Shares, rights and corporate bonds are divided in three tiers, depending on how they fulfil the NSC requirements (www.kmarket.ro, section “Presentation. History”). Currently, at the first tier there are 21 securities listed, at the second 38 securities and at the third one security (www.kmarket.ro, section “Listed shares”).

Several indices are computed by the BSE. The most important are BET, which includes the most liquid 10 shares from the first tier, and BET-COMPOZIT, which include all the shares from the first and the second tier. Some descriptive statistics for the BET Index evolution are presented in Figure 1.

In this figure descriptive statistics are provided for the series of nominal and real return on BET. The data regarding the BET index was provided by the Bucharest Stock Exchange site (www.bvb.ro). Monthly data for the period 1997 - 2007 was used, taking into account that the BET index was computed starting with July 1997. In this study the index value has been considered as the last working day of the month. The index monthly return was computed according to the relationship:

\[
\text{Return on Index} = \frac{\text{Index at the end of the month} - \text{Index at the beginning of the month}}{\text{Index at the beginning of the month}}
\]

As the studied period was characterized by high inflation, an analysis of the real monthly return was also performed. Data on the monthly inflation rate was provided by the Romanian National Institute of Statistics.
Figure 1. Descriptive statistics for BET Romanian market index (1997-2007)
In the development period of the Romanian capital market (before 2002), the most important events were: (i) setting up the market for unlisted securities traded through the system of the stock market (1999); (ii) the listing of the five financial investment companies - SIF (1999); (iii) the trade of the first deposit certificates issued by a bank and the first issue of corporate bonds (listed on RASDAQ in 2000); (iv) the first transaction with derivatives at the Sibiu Monetary – Financial and Commodities Exchange (2000); (v) the first listing of municipal bonds at the Bucharest Stock Market Exchange (2001) (www.kmarket.ro, section “Documentaries and analysis”).

The year 2002 brought changes for the capital market regulations that created the framework for introducing a lot of innovations: rights’ transactions, options on shares, futures on stock market indices, short sales etc. Among the effects of the new regulations that can be mentioned are: raising the standards of transparency, investors’ protection, improving the activity of the market’s intermediaries and the growth of the market’s activity. The change of investors’ perception made the capital market a viable alternative to invest, 2002 being a year of growth in shares’ quotations and as a result in indices.

During 2003-2007 BSE had an encouraging evolution, which could be explained by the increase of foreign investors’ funds flow as an effect of Romania’s accession to the European Union, and by the development of large companies and also by several mass privatizations. However, some studies related to Romanian capital market questioned the market efficiency (see, for instance, Dragotă, Mitrică, 2004).

The development of capital markets seems to depend, in a great measure, on ensuring the conditions for information disclosure and also on setting up the framework which would encourage the minority shareholders to invest. Therefore, studying minority shareholders’ protection became a frequent subject of analysis. In the existing literature, some issues can be mentioned: (i) the analysis of minority shareholders’ protection in different countries (La Porta, Lopez-de-Silanes, Shleifer, and Vishny, 1998, 2000; Pajuste, 2002; Klapper, Laeven, Love, 2006); (ii) the impact of minority shareholders’ protection on capital market development (Modigliani, Perotti, 1997, Pagano, Volpin, 2006); (iii) the estimation of the optimum control level and its impact on company value (Butz, 1994, Pagano, Roell, 1998, Claessens, Djankov, Fan, Lang, 2002, Edwards, Weichenrieder, 2004)\(^1\); (iv) the protection of the investors and the effects on company value (Yarrow, 1985, Zingales, 1994, La Porta, Lopez-de-Silanes, Shleifer, Vishny, 2002, Buysschaert, Deloof, Jegers, 2003) etc.

Modigliani and Perotti (1997) consider that the essential conditions for capital market development are: (i) the existence of proper legislation; (ii) the appropriate enforcement of the law and (iii) the guarantee of free trade. The absence of adequate legislation or of an efficient implementation mechanism generates a low
confidence in capital markets and weak efficiency, as a result of restricted transactions. Inadequate legislation or inefficient enforcement mechanisms lead to a low protection of minority shareholders, thus making possible the existence of higher control premiums. The conclusions of Modigliani and Perotti (1997) are similar to Nenova (2003), revealing that lower control premiums are connected to economies with developed capital markets, while higher levels are specific to the bank-oriented countries. Hence, Romania, having a small capital market(2), may be included in the class of countries with low protection. In this context, Dragotã et al. (2007) estimated a control premium for Romanian listed shares in the period 2002-2004, with a median of 44.62% and an average of 82.44%.

It has to be emphasized that it is not only the institutional factors that have a dominant influence on the capital market, but the company financial policies and the corporate governance, too. Thus, in some countries, even if the legislation is more relaxed, the shareholders benefit from an adequate treatment because of the custom of the company to acquire financial resources through the capital market (Albuquerque, Wang, 2005).

Analyzing the influence of minority shareholders’ protection on the development of the capital market, Pagano and Volpin (2006) build a model used to prove the existence of a bidirectional relationship between the variable reflecting minority shareholders protection, namely La Porta et al. (1998) index, and variables reflecting capital market development. The conclusion is that the improvement of minority shareholders’ protection leads to capital market development and that a developed capital market determines the efficiency of the mechanisms ensuring the minority shareholders’ protection.

The issue of corporate governance for Romania became a field of interest in the past few years (Mallin, 2000, Pajuste, 2002, Hashi, 2004, Claessens, Tzioumis, 2006, Dragotã, Semenescu, Pele, Liparã, 2008 etc.). The seminal literature dealing with the protection of the minority shareholders in ex Communist countries is represented by Pistor et al. (2000) and Pajuste (2002). We can mention that in Romania, companies with major shareholders owning a large percentage of the capital set dividend ratios lower than the others (Dragotã, 2006). The average stake owned by the major shareholder is very large (the average first shareholder control percentage is 53%, and for the second is 16.6%). Also, the control premium for the companies listed on the Romanian capital market is higher than the world average (Dragotã et al., 2007).

This study analyzes the evolution of minority shareholders’ protection regulations measured through the Pistor, Reiser and Gelfer (2000) index applied to the Romanian capital market. The rest of this paper is organized as follows. The evolution of regulation in the field of capital markets over the period 1996-2008 and the way it was reflected in the index quantifying the minority shareholders protection in Romania is described in Section 2. Section 3 concludes the study.
2. Minority shareholders protection in Romania

The measurement of the minority shareholders protection may be completed by construction of some indices like the one of La Porta et al. (1998), Pistor et al. (2000), Lele and Siems (2007), etc. A specific index for the East European countries, the ex-communist ones, is the one recommended by Pistor et al. (2000).

The present Romanian capital market is relatively young and the legislation has had a dynamic evolution. The main legislative events that influenced the protection of minority shareholders’ rights are presented in Appendix 1. In order to reveal the evolution of Romanian legislation related to minority shareholders’ protection, Pistor et al. index (2000) was estimated. This index was also used by Pajuste (2002) in order to analyse corporate governance issues behind stock market performance in nine Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries, over the period June 1994-June 2001.

Comparatively to the La Porta et al. (1998) index, the Pistor et al. index (2000) was considered because of the more detailed analysis of legislation concerning minority shareholders’ protection\(^3\). As a result, small changes of the regulations in force are reflected in the index level.

The legal index introduced by Pistor et al. (2000) is based on the sum of three indices, in their turn explained by some market characteristics as follows: (1) Voice, which shows the minority shareholders power to be informed and to exercise their right to vote. This index quantifies the voting power of minority shareholders, the easiness of exercising their right to vote and of subscribing to the new shares issues; (2) Exit, which is a variable showing how easy the minority shareholders may liquidate their positions at the right price if they consider their rights are not fulfilled; (3) Stock Market Integrity index, which is a variable defining the capital market regulation and the legislative protection of the minority shareholders.

Based on the Pistor et al. (2000) index, a similar analysis for the Romanian legislation for the period 1996-2008 has been performed. The 24 characteristics taken into account in the Pistor et al. (2000) index have been analysed in accordance with the Romanian legal settlements concerning the minority shareholders protection. The index has been computed monthly. The impact of the legislative changes on this index was considered starting the month after they appeared. After analysing the regulations on corporations and capital market (see Appendix 1), the result was 13 points for the legislative index registered in 1996, reaching a maximum of 17.75 points in May 2002, a level which remained the same until the end of 2006 (see Table 1)\(^4\). The updates of Company Law (Law no. 441/2006) that allow decisions of the Shareholders’ Assembly be taken with a quorum of only 1/4 of the shareholders have decreased the index level to 17.25. The issues for which the legislation has registered deficiencies during the entire period of the study are as follows: (i) the right for voting by mail; (ii) the lack of an
obligation to register the shares by a specific date in order to have the right to participate in the Shareholders General Meeting; (iii) the requirement of the qualified majority (at least 3/4) for fundamental decisions, including charter changes, liquidation of companies, sales of major assets; (iv) the existence of the right to transfer the shares without legal, statutory or constitutive documents’ restrictions; (v) the obligation that corporate statutes must specify a certain amount of dividends to be paid to shareholders. The cumulative vote; the existence of a minimum limit above which takeover offers are compulsory, the shareholders’ register to be kept by an independent company, the right of the shareholders owning less than 10% to invoke the censors’ committee, the prohibition of insiders’ transactions, the disclosure obligation on transactions which result in the acquisition of a significant percentage of shares. These represent criteria which have been fulfilled over time, the effect being the growth of the index from 13 to 17.75 (until December 2006).

The monthly level of Pistor, Raiser and Gelfer legislative index, estimated for Romanian case in the period Jan. 1996 – March. 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Pistor, Raiser and Gelfer Index</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Pistor, Raiser and Gelfer Index</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Pistor, Raiser and Gelfer Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Feb.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Apr.</td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Apr.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Apr.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Aug.</td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Aug.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Sept.</td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Feb.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Apr.</td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Apr.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Apr.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Sept.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Oct.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Oct.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Dec.</td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Dec.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Jan.</td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Dec.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Jan.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Feb.</td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Jan.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Feb.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Feb.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Apr.</td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the changes in regulations seem to improve the minority shareholders protection, the enforcement of the law is the problem that remains. An exhaustive presentation for enforcement of the law indices is made in Kaufman et al. (2005). However, in their paper there is no clear evidence regarding a change in enforcement of the law in Romania over the analyzed period. The evolution of the Romania enforcement of the law index is presented in the International Country Risk Guide. The figures revealed by this publication show a decrease of “law and order” index, that had a level of 5 (from a maximal value of 6) in the period 1996 – January 1999, to 4 points since February 1999. From this perspective, the improvement of legislative protection of the minority shareholders can be partly offset by the regress manifested in the enforcement of the law field.

### 3. Conclusions

This study offers a presentation of the stages in the evolution of the developments related to the minority shareholders protection in Romania for the period 1996-2008, measured by the Pistor, Raiser and Gelfer (2000) index. It can be noticed that this index improves from 13 (January 1996) to 17. 25 (March 2008). The result shows to investors interested in the Romanian capital market that the minority shareholders’ protection has increased over the years.
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Notes

(1) Given the characteristics of each economy, the optimal control level is not the same. The deviations from this optimal level generate a decrease in company market value, with effects on investors’ behaviour on the specific share market.

(2) In 2007, the market capitalization represented 35,326.04 millions USD, respectively around 21.24% from the gross domestic product, but the annual transaction volume represented almost 15.72% of the market capitalization.

(3) The Antidirector Rights Index, proposed by La Porta, Lopez-de-Silanes, Shleifer and Vishny (1998), quantifies the existence of adequate regulations, scaling from 0 to 6, where 0 represents the lowest minority shareholders protection. In Romania this index reached 2.75 points in 2005 (Dragotă, 2006). This level is very close to the world average. For comparison, the median values for this index in English-origin countries, based on „common law”, equals 4, as for the countries based on French law and German law the average level is 2.33, while Scandinavian law countries reach 3 points.

(4) The maximum level for this index is 23.

References

Dragotă, V., Dumitrescu, D., Ruxanda, G., Ciobanu, A., Brasoveanu, I., Stoian, A., Lipară, C., „Estimation of Control Premium: The Case of Romanian Listed
Mallin, C., Jelic, R., „Developments in Corporate Governance in Central and Eastern Europe”, Corporate Governance: An International Review, 8, 2000, pp. 43-51
Pistor, K., Raiser, M., Gelfer, S., „Law and finance in transition economies”, Economics of transition, 8, 2000, pp. 325-368
Trojanowski, G., „Equity Block Transfers in Transition Economies: Evidence from Poland”, EFA Annual Conference, 467, 2003
Yarrow, G.K., „Shareholder Protection, Compulsory Acquisition and Efficiency of the Takeover Process”, The Journal of Industrial Economics, 34, 1985, pp. 3-16
www.bvb.ro
www.kmarket.ro
The evolution of minority shareholders’ protection legislation in Romania.
A chronological presentation

The Romanian legislation may be divided into two categories: (a) Primary legislation: laws, ordinances, governmental resolutions; (b) Secondary legislation: regulations and decisions of the National Securities Commission. The following dates represent points in time when the respective documents came into force.

- December, 17th, 1990: The Law no. 31 – The Company Act established the fundamental characteristics for corporations. It is the first act that established the shareholder’s rights equality. As there were no specific rules, the transactions with shares were made respecting the simple trading rules. The ones who wanted to sell using publicity had to make a prospectus. It was established that the shareholders will be represented in the general shareholders meeting proportionally with equity holdings. Each share gave the right to one vote, but it was possible to diminish the number of votes for the shareholders who owned more than one share.

- October, 15th, 1992: The „Agency Natională pentru Titluri de Valoare” (The National Agency for Securities) was set up as regulator for trading shares and trading agents. It was a part of the Economics and Finance Ministry. The content of a public offer was also established and the rules for giving information to the shareholders on a company’s result.

- August, 26th, 1993: “Agency Natională pentru Titluri de Valoare” (The National Agency for Securities) transformed into “Agency de Valori Mobiliare” (The Agency for Securities), which represented a general office of the Ministry of Finance. The transactions with securities had to be made only by an authorized agent. For the first time some rules were established in the shareholders’ protection field.

- September, 1st, 1994: The Law No. 52, on securities and stock exchanges. It settled “Comisia Națională de Valori Mobiliare” (The National Securities Commission) - an autonomous administrative authority and a legal person. It undertook the tasks from the Agency for Securities which stopped functioning. It settled the public offer and the securities trading. It also established that stock exchanges be created as public institutions, by the decision of the National Securities Commission. It regulated the operations allowed on a stock exchange. It also established some rules about investors’ protection, portfolio consultants and the share register.

- April, 24th, 1995: The Decision No. 20 of the National Securities Commission, which created the Bucharest Stock Exchange. Its first transaction session was on November, 20th.

- May, 7th, 1996: The National Securities Commission regulates the periodical and continuous information reports made by the issuers of securities. It established the reports which had to be made by the issuers to the National Securities Commission and published, for example: current reports, semester reports and annual reports. It also established the treatment for confidential information and the list of persons considered to have such information.

- October, 25th, 1996: RASDAQ was founded, the Romanian over-the-counter market.

- June, 27th, 1997: the Company Act was modified: preferential shares were introduced and the regulation of shares transactions was left to the special law on securities and stock exchanges. It was also decided that the shares not fully paid will not have voting rights, unless the company by-laws permitted this.
August, 6th, 2001: Bucharest Stock Exchange adopted the Running and Management Code of Corporate Governance, which undertook the corporate governance principles of OECD. This established the shareholders’ rights as follows: the right to participate in the General Meetings, the right to ask questions at the General Meetings gathering, the right to debate the issues on the General Meeting’s agenda, the right to receive information, the right to receive dividends, the right to participate in the major decisions of the company’s management, the right to be represented in the Administration Board, the preference shareholders’ rights. There were also established the duties of administrators in the shareholders’ protection area. The Company Act in 1990 had fixed all these rights and the capital market specific legislation supported the shareholders’ right to be informed.

April, 4th, 2002: There were established the roles and objectives of the National Securities Commission on the market. These are as follows: “a) to establish and maintain the necessary background for the development of the regulated market; b) the promotion of trust in regulated markets and in financial instruments investments; c) to ensure the protection of investors and operators against the illegal, abusive and fraudulent practices; d) the promotion of the correct and transparent functioning of the regulated markets; e) the prevention of market manipulation, of fraud and the insurance of the integrity of the regulated markets; f) to fix the standards for the financial solidarity and honest practice of the regulated markets; g) to adopt the necessary measures to avoid systemic risk in markets; h) to prevent the lack of equality in investors’ information, treatment or in the respect of their interests”.

April, the 9th, 2002: A new Governmental Ordinance on securities, financial investment services and the regulated markets. It established the stock exchanges as public institutions but also the possibility to organize other regulated markets as joint-stock companies. It regulated the types of market operations and introduced margin transactions, transactions of preferential rights and also transactions with derivatives. It detailed the significance of investors’ protection emphasizing the importance of the Company Act in this area and the special rules for listed companies. It established rules for market-disclosure and equality between investors. For the first time in Romania, it prohibited the handling of the market and transactions based on inside information. The Fund for Investors’ Compensation started its activity. Also, this Act regulated the activity of the financial investments companies, the investment consultants, the compensation, deduction, deposit and registering systems, etc.

August, 5th, 2002: The Governmental Ordinance was approved by law with some amendments. In the initial version, the shareholders may ask for intermediary reports about the financial situation of the company only if they own individually 5% or in common 10%. The law modified the threshold to 5% of the capital for both individually or in common.

July, 1st, 2004: A new settlement of The National Securities Commission on the issuers and the securities operations. It established the reports which had to be presented by the listed shares issuers and the treatment of preferential information.

July, 29th, 2004: The Law No. 597 on the capital market. It transposed the European orders in the capital market field, as follows: a) Directive No. 93/22/CEE, on investment services in the securities field; b) Directive No. 97/9/CEE, on investor-compensation schemes; c) Directive No. 85/611/ CEE, on the coordination of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to undertakings for collective investment in transferable securities (UCITS); d) Directive No. 98/26/CEE on settlement finality in payment and securities settlement systems; e) Directive No. 2003/71/CEE, on the pro-
spectus to be published when securities are offered to the public or admitted to trading and amending Directive No. 2001/34/EC; f) Directive No. 2001/34/CEE, on the admission of securities to official stock exchange listing and on information to be published on those securities; g) Directive No. 2003/6/CEE, on insider dealing and market manipulation (market abuse); h) Directive No. 2002/65/CEE, concerning the distance marketing of consumer financial services; i) Directive No. 1993/6/CEE, on the capital adequacy of investment firms and credit institutions.


- December 1st 2006, The Law no. 441 modified the Company Act bringing fundamental changes as regards the companies’ administration. Thus two systems of administration were introduced: a unitary system, based on an administration council, and a dualist system, based on a managerial board and a supervisory council. A fundamental change was that the decisions of the Shareholders’ Assembly may be taken with a quorum of only 1/4 of the shareholders.