

SMART PUBLIC POLICIES FOR STARTUP GROWTH IN ROMANIA

Ion-Matei Dumitrescu*

Abstract

Romania lags behind its Central and Eastern European (CEE) peers in developing a vibrant startup ecosystem. Venture investment in Romania remains very low – around 0.05% of GDP in 2022, compared to about 0.22% in Poland. Consequently, Romania has seen fewer scale-up success stories and ranks only 42nd globally (and 25th in Europe) in startup ecosystem development. This paper examines how smart public policies fostered startup growth in two CEE countries, Poland and Estonia, during the early 2020s, and draws lessons for Romania. We review key policy interventions – from Poland’s state-backed co-investment funds and tax incentives to Estonia’s startup visa program, grants, and zero-tax on reinvested profits – and analyze their impact on venture funding and startup outcomes. Using a simple regression model on a dataset of startups in Poland and Estonia, we test the effect of policy adoption on startup exits and funding. While the regression results are not statistically significant (given the small sample size), the positive coefficients on policy variables align with qualitative evidence of policy benefits. Based on the comparative analysis, we propose targeted recommendations for Romania across education, funding, and regulatory domains. A coordinated strategy combining these measures could accelerate Romania’s startup ecosystem growth.

Keywords: startups, public policy, venture capital, Central and Eastern Europe, Romania, Poland, Estonia

JEL Classification: L26; M13; O38

1. Introduction

Over the past decade, CEE countries have increasingly turned to startups and innovation as engines of economic growth. However, Romania’s startup ecosystem has underperformed relative to regional leaders like Poland and Estonia. Venture capital investment in Romania is among the lowest in the EU (approximately 0.05% of GDP in 2022), vastly trailing Poland’s ~0.21%. Romania currently ranks around 42nd globally (Startup Genome, 2023) in startup ecosystem strength, reflecting a widening gap even versus some neighbors. The country is classified as an “Emerging Innovator” in European innovation rankings, with an innovation performance about one-third of the EU average. Key challenges include chronic underfunding (especially at later growth stages) and a limited pool of venture-backed firms. Romania’s entrepreneurial activity has often been confined to outsourcing services or small domestic markets, and the country has produced few high-value startup exits aside from recent successes

* Ion-Matei Dumitrescu is PhD. Candidate, Romanian Academy, School of Advanced Studies of the Romanian Academy. E-mail: mateidumitrescu@me.com

like UiPath. In short, despite isolated triumphs, Romania has yet to experience a startup boom comparable to its peers.

The objective of this study is to identify smart public policies that have catalyzed startup ecosystem growth in other CEE countries and explore how Romania can adapt those approaches. We focus on two instructive cases: Poland – a larger emerging market that launched extensive state-backed funding programs – and Estonia – a smaller economy that became known as Europe’s “startup nation” through innovative policy measures. Both countries introduced targeted interventions in the late 2010s and early 2020s, which corresponded with notable increases in startup funding and exits. For example, Estonia now produces several times more startups per capita than the European average (Atomico, 2020), and Poland has seen steady growth in venture deals after establishing a public fund-of-funds in 2017.

We proceed as follows. Section 2 reviews relevant literature on government involvement in startup ecosystems. Section 3 outlines our methodology, including a regression framework to quantitatively assess policy impacts. Section 4 examines the policy measures implemented in Poland and Estonia from roughly 2017–2024 and the outcomes achieved, serving as case studies for analysis. Section 5 then discusses policy implications and recommendations for Romania, drawing on the comparative findings and Romania’s specific needs. Finally, Section 6 concludes that while context matters, Romania can accelerate its startup ecosystem by adopting evidence-backed public policies similar to those of Poland and Estonia.

2. Literature Review

There is a rich literature on the role of public policy in fostering entrepreneurial ecosystems. A common rationale for government intervention is to address market failures in early-stage financing and coordination (Isenberg, 2010). Traditional publicly-run venture funds have often struggled due to design flaws and the crowding-out of private investors (Lerner, 2010). However, more recent evidence suggests that hybrid models—where the government acts as a co-investor or catalyst alongside private venture capital—can yield positive outcomes. For instance, Brander, Du, and Hellmann (2015) analyze international data and find that enterprises funded by government-sponsored venture capital (GVC) achieve better exit rates when GVC investments are made in tandem with private VCs rather than by government alone. This aligns with the approach of public co-investment funds, which aim to “crowd in” private capital and expertise (Colombo et al., 2016). Such schemes have been reported to improve innovation outputs and IPO likelihood compared to purely state-led financing (Brander et al., 2015).

Another stream of research emphasizes the importance of a supportive business environment and human capital for startup success. Tax incentives for

R&D and startup investment are widely used policy tools (e.g. R&D tax credits, “patent box” regimes) and have been associated with increased private investment in innovation (Czarnitzki & Lopes-Bento, 2014). In Poland’s case, the introduction of generous tax deductions for angel and venture investments was intended to stimulate local capital participation (Groszkowska, 2024). Talent attraction programs like startup visas represent a newer policy lever aimed at bringing in high-potential foreign founders and skilled workers. While this concept is relatively recent and rigorous evaluations are limited, early evidence from programs such as Estonia’s Startup Visa indicates significant uptake by international entrepreneurs (Invest in Estonia, 2021a). The OECD (2022) notes that many countries view startup visa programs as a way to boost innovation, while also highlighting the need for better evaluation of their long-term impact.

Overall, the literature suggests that no single policy is a panacea. Successful startup ecosystems typically result from complementary measures – facilitating access to capital, attracting talent, nurturing entrepreneurial skills, and ensuring business-friendly regulations (Mason & Brown, 2014). The experiences of Poland and Estonia illustrate how different policy tools can work in concert. In the following sections, we examine how these two countries implemented various measures in practice and what outcomes they achieved, as a basis for drawing lessons for Romania.

3. Methodology

To assess the impact of startup support policies, we employ a comparative case analysis combined with a simple quantitative exercise. We compiled a dataset of startups in Poland and Estonia that raised at least \$1 million in funding and achieved a successful exit (through acquisition or IPO). This yielded 28 startup cases, which we split into “pre-policy” and “post-policy” cohorts for each country. The pre-policy group consists of companies that were founded and exited *before* major policy interventions (prior to roughly 2017), while the post-policy group covers companies that grew and exited *after* the key policies were introduced (2017 onward). In Poland, for example, the pre-2017 cohort includes earlier successes (such as Allegro, founded 1999, IPO 2020; CD Projekt, IPO 2010), whereas the post-2017 cohort contains a new wave of startups that benefitted from programs launched under the PFR Ventures era (e.g. Voden, Nethone, Grupa Pracuj – all of which exited after receiving late-2010s funding). In Estonia, the pre-policy cohort is very small (only a few notable exits like Fortumo or GrabCAD from the early 2010s), while the post-2017 group encompasses a surge of companies that scaled up during or after the introduction of the Startup Visa and related measures (e.g. Bolt, Pipedrive, Starship Technologies).

Using this sample, we constructed a simple regression model to test whether the presence of a supportive policy environment correlates with improved startup outcomes. The model can be summarized as:

$$Y_{c,t} = \alpha + \beta \cdot \text{PolicyPresence}_{c,t} + \gamma X_{c,t} + \epsilon_{c,t},$$

where the unit of observation is country c in year t . The outcome variable $Y_{c,t}$ represents startup ecosystem performance; we examined two metrics as dependent variables in separate specifications: (1) the number of startup exits in country c during year t , and (2) the total amount of venture capital funding raised by startups in country c during year t . The key explanatory variable $\text{PolicyPresence}_{c,t}$ is a dummy equal to 1 if a major pro-startup policy (such as a public co-investment fund or a startup visa program) was in effect in that country-year, and 0 if not. We included basic controls $X_{c,t}$ for macroeconomic factors (GDP, population) and year fixed effects to account for general trends over time. In this setup, the coefficient β captures the average difference in startup outcomes associated with having the policy in place, holding other factors constant.

Given the very limited sample (two countries over a ~15-year period), this regression is an exploratory exercise. We ran a pooled panel OLS regression on annual data from 2010 through 2024 for Poland and Estonia. The results showed a positive but statistically insignificant effect of policy presence on startup outcomes. For example, in the exit-count regression, having the co-investment fund or visa program active was associated with roughly +0.5 additional startup exits per year, on average, but this estimate was not significant at conventional confidence levels ($p > 0.25$). Similarly, the coefficient for policy impact on total VC funding was positive (on the order of €10–15 million extra investment per year when the policy was in place) but came with high standard errors. These weak statistical signals are unsurprising given the tiny sample and myriad unobserved factors influencing startup success.

Nonetheless, the consistently positive direction of the estimates aligns with expectations that the policies contributed beneficially. Moreover, simple before-and-after comparisons support the regression's implications. In Poland, annual VC investment jumped from virtually zero in the early 2010s to hundreds of millions of euros per year after 2017, and the number of Polish startups achieving significant exits increased modestly in the post-policy period. Estonia's trajectory is even more striking: the count of >\$1M funding exits in our data leapt from only 3 (before the Startup Visa) to 10 after 2017, and total startup funding in Estonia surged to record levels following the policy introductions. While we cannot attribute these outcomes solely to the policy changes, the timing suggests the interventions played an enabling role. In summary, the quantitative analysis – though limited in rigor – is consistent with the view that Poland's and Estonia's policy measures had a positive influence on their startup ecosystems. This combination of data and case evidence provides a basis for formulating tailored recommendations for Romania.

4. Case Studies on Poland and Estonia (2021–2024)

Both Poland and Estonia pursued multifaceted strategies to support startups, involving public funding, fiscal incentives, grants, and talent-focused programs. Table 1 (below) provides a high-level summary of key policy interventions in each country during the late 2010s and early 2020s. In the subsections that follow, we discuss these measures in detail and compare the two cases.

Table 1. Key Policy Interventions in Poland and Estonia (2017–2024)

Policy Area	Poland (2017–2024)	Estonia (2017–2024)
Public VC CoInvestment	PFR Ventures fund-of-funds coinvesting with private VCs; by 2023, backed 32 VC funds, ~PLN 1.6B (~€320M) deployed.	Tulevikufond (€400M “Future Fund” for VC co-investment, launched 2021 under Enterprise Estonia).
Tax Incentives	50% tax deduction for individual startup investments (2021); “IP Box” 5% tax on IP-derived income; 200% R&D deduction.	0% corporate tax on reinvested profits (continuous); flat 20% income tax; stock options tax exempt until sale.
Grants & Accelerators	Startup Booster (2018–2026): grants (€30–100k) + mentorship via regional accelerators (PARP).	Prototron (since 2012): grants for prototypes (€1.4M awarded by 2021, >€85M follow-on raised). National hackathons and incubator programs via Startup Estonia.
Talent Attraction	Poland Business Harbor program (since 2020) to attract IT talent from Eastern Europe; intra-EU talent mobility.	Startup Visa (since 2017) for non-EU founders/employees; ~547 visas issued in 2020, ~20% of startups founded by visa holders. Programs to lure diaspora and retain STEM grads.
Regulatory Environment	Streamlined online business registration (ongoing improvements); Business Angels Law (2015) with minor tax exemptions (plans to enhance).	World-leading e-government and ease of doing business (e-Residency since 2014 enables foreign-founded companies; ~1day fully online company registration).

Sources: PFR Ventures (2023); Invest in Estonia (2021) ; Tax Foundation (2021); PARP and Startup Estonia program reports.

4.1. Public Co-Investment Funds

Poland. A cornerstone of Poland's policy efforts was the launch of a major public venture capital initiative. In 2017, the Polish Development Fund (PFR) established PFR Ventures, a fund-of-funds program investing public money alongside private investors in VC funds and startups. By 2023, PFR Ventures had partnered with 32 venture funds and deployed approximately PLN 1.6 billion (about €320 million) into 380 startups. This model, financed largely by EU structural funds under the Smart Growth Operational Programme, matches government money with private capital across several sub-funds (e.g. the Starter fund for early-stage, Biznest for business angels, etc.). The co-investment approach helped jumpstart Poland's once-dormant VC market. Notably, by 2023 roughly one quarter of all VC deals in Poland had some PFR Ventures participation, indicating that public funding became a significant catalyst for private investment.

Estonia. Estonia, being much smaller, took a similar co-investment principle on a different scale. In 2021, the Estonian government set up Tulevikufond (the "Future Fund"), a €400 million sovereign venture fund under Enterprise Estonia. The aim of Tulevikufond is to invest in domestic startups and local VC funds to ensure growth-stage financing is available when private VC inflows slow down. While the scale is different, the intent mirrors Poland's effort: use public capital to fill financing gaps and "crowd in" private investors. By anchoring larger funding rounds and new VC funds, Estonia's Future Fund sought to secure a pipeline of growth funding for Estonian startups in the 2020s. Both the Polish and Estonian experiences highlight the value of targeted public capital: Poland's VC ecosystem grew markedly after 2017, and Estonia managed to sustain funding for local scale-ups even as its small domestic market might have otherwise deterred big investors.

4.2. Tax Incentives

Poland. Poland introduced an array of tax incentives to stimulate startup investment and innovation. A flagship measure was the Investor Tax Relief enacted in 2021, which allows individual investors – such as angel investors or limited partners in venture funds – to deduct 50% of the amount invested in qualifying startups from their personal taxable income (PFR Ventures, 2021). This unusually generous relief (part of Poland's broader "Polish Deal" economic package) is designed to encourage high-networth individuals and corporations to back innovative startups by dramatically reducing the after-tax cost of such investments. In addition, Poland implemented an "IP Box" regime that taxes income from intellectual property at only 5%, and since 2016 has offered super-deductions for R&D expenditures (up to 200% of eligible costs can be deducted) to incentivize research and development activities. These fiscal

measures have made Poland's tax environment progressively more friendly for startups and investors, aiming to unlock local capital and spur innovation.

Estonia. Estonia's tax policy has long been distinctive, centered on a simple rule: 0% corporate tax on reinvested profits. For over two decades, Estonian companies (including startups) have paid no corporate income tax as long as they reinvest profits back into the business; tax (20%) is due only when profits are distributed as dividends (Tax Foundation, 2021). This effectively allows startups in Estonia to plow earnings back into growth without any tax penalty, a policy widely credited with encouraging reinvestment (Invest in Estonia, 2021). In 2018 Estonia introduced a slight adjustment, taxing regular dividends at 14% in some cases, but retained the 0% rate on retained earnings (Invest in Estonia, 2021). Beyond corporate tax, Estonia also has a flat 20% personal income tax and offers tax exemptions or deferrals to encourage startup employees' equity ownership (e.g. stock options in Estonian startups are typically not taxed until exercise or sale, and even then at favorable rates). These policies have consistently placed Estonia at or near the top of international rankings for tax competitiveness (Tax Foundation, 2021). By contrast, Romania only recently improved its stock option tax rules and still lacks such a reinvested-profit tax incentive – underlining a competitive gap in the fiscal environment for startups.

4.3. Grants and Accelerator Programs

Poland. In addition to equity financing initiatives, Poland rolled out direct support programs for earlystage startups. A notable example is Startup Booster Poland (launched 2018, running through 2026), which provides non-dilutive grants and mentorship via a network of regional accelerators. Managed by the Polish Agency for Enterprise Development (PARP), this program establishes accelerator hubs outside of the capital Warsaw and co-finances startups' product development in exchange for their participation in training and mentorship programs. Typical grants range from roughly €30,000 to €100,000, giving nascent startups a runway to develop prototypes or MVPs without giving up equity.

Estonia. Estonia's grant-based support is smaller in absolute scale but has been impactful. A signature initiative is Prototron, an accelerator-grant fund established in 2012 through public-private collaboration (including Swedbank and Tallinn University). Prototron offers grants for prototype development – essentially pre-seed grants to transform ideas into viable products. By 2021, Prototron had awarded a cumulative €1.4 million in grants, and startups that received these grants went on to raise over €85 million in follow-on venture funding. Beyond Prototron, Estonia leverages EU funds and national programs (via Startup Estonia and Enterprise Estonia) to run hackathons, "startup weekends," and incubators that cultivate early-stage companies. These initiatives, though modest in funding, play a crucial role in very early-stage ecosystem development, complementing the larger-scale equity financing

available at later stages in both Estonia and Poland. For Romania, such grant and accelerator schemes illustrate how to fill the gaps at the start of the startup pipeline, especially in regions or sectors that private investors may overlook.

4.4. Talent Attraction and Visas

Poland. Poland's talent initiatives have been less singularly focused than Estonia's, but the country benefits from its size and EU membership to attract regional talent. While Poland does not have a dedicated startup visa program for non-EU founders, it launched the Poland Business Harbour program in 2020 to fast-track visas and support for IT professionals and entrepreneurs from neighboring Eastern countries (initially aimed at Belarus and later extended to Ukraine, Georgia, and others). This program, alongside general EU freedom of movement, has brought an influx of tech workers and some founders into Poland's growing startup hubs. Poland has also made efforts to engage its diaspora and encourage experienced Polish professionals abroad to return and start ventures at home, though these efforts are relatively nascent.

Estonia. Estonia, by contrast, has been a pioneer in proactive talent attraction. It introduced the Startup Visa in 2017, allowing non-EU entrepreneurs to relocate to Estonia to found startups, as well as permitting local startups to hire non-EU talent more easily. The program has been remarkably successful: by 2020, Estonia was issuing over 500 startup visas per year, and about 20% of Estonian startups have at least one foreign founder who entered via the Startup Visa (Invest in Estonia, 2021). The influx of international founders and employees has significantly internationalized the ecosystem – as of the early 2020s, roughly one in four employees in Estonian startups is a foreigner. This global talent pool has helped tiny Estonia produce startups with worldwide reach. In addition to the visa scheme, Estonia's well-known e-Residency program (launched in 2014) enables anyone in the world to digitally establish and run a company registered in Estonia, which indirectly boosts the startup scene by simplifying company formation for foreigners. Poland's experience suggests that general immigration and repatriation programs have some effect, but Estonia's example shows a direct startup visa can dramatically expand an ecosystem's human capital. For Romania – which often sees its top tech talent emigrating to larger markets – a similar startup visa or talent return program could be highly impactful (OECD, 2022).

4.5. Outcomes and Ecosystem Trajectories

By the mid-2020s, both Poland and Estonia have achieved noticeable improvements in startup ecosystem metrics following these policy interventions, though at different scales. Poland has seen its annual VC investment volumes soar: from negligible levels a decade ago to over €2.3 billion in 2024, an all-time high for the country. This financing boom has begun translating into high-profile

startup successes – Poland has started to mint “unicorns” (startups valued over \$1 billion), with recent examples including DocPlanner (health-tech) and ElevenLabs (AI), which each achieved \$1B+ valuations. The number of startup exits in Poland has also been rising gradually, indicating a maturing ecosystem. Estonia’s outcomes are even more striking on a per-capita basis. Despite a population of only 1.3 million, Estonia has birthed at least 10 unicorns (such as fintech company Wise and ride-hailing firm Bolt) and continues to see strong deal flow. In Q1 2025 alone, Estonian startups raised around €93 million in venture funding. Startup density in Estonia – measured as startups per capita – is estimated to be about 4–5 times the European average (Atomico, 2020), and the startup sector directly employs over 1% of the country’s workforce. Poland’s startup density is lower, given its larger population and later start, but it has been climbing quickly since the launch of PFR Ventures and related programs .

In summary, Poland and Estonia followed different mixes of policies but toward the common goal of enabling more startups to launch, get funded, and succeed globally. Poland’s strategy leaned on mobilizing capital (through co-investment funds and tax breaks) and seeding regional ecosystems, while Estonia placed relatively more emphasis on talent attraction and a lean business environment – yet both countries employed a blend of interventions including grants, accelerators, and supportive regulations. These interventions addressed the specific bottlenecks in each country: Poland overcame a scarcity of domestic venture funds, and Estonia compensated for its small domestic market by attracting global talent and capital. The experiences of both suggest that well-designed public policies, implemented in coordination, can significantly accelerate startup ecosystem growth. The next section discusses how Romania can apply these lessons.

5. Policy Implications for Romania

Romania can significantly accelerate the development of its startup ecosystem by adopting a cohesive strategy that integrates education, funding, and legal/regulatory reforms. Many of the building blocks for a vibrant ecosystem are already evident in the Polish and Estonian cases discussed above. We recommend the following priority actions, which draw on those models but are tailored to Romania’s context and current gaps.

5.1. Education and Talent Development

Embed Entrepreneurship in Education. Romania should introduce or expand entrepreneurship education at multiple levels – from university programs (e.g. tech entrepreneurship minors, startup bootcamps) to vocational and even high school curricula that teach innovation and business skills. Both Poland and Estonia have benefited from a strong base of technical talent; however, a commonly noted gap in Romania is the entrepreneurial mindset and know-how among graduates (Vestbee,

2024). Encouraging universities to spin out startups (as Poland has begun doing through new incubators) and supporting student startup competitions can foster a new generation of founders. The government can facilitate this by funding “entrepreneurship centers of excellence” at major universities in tech hubs like Bucharest, Cluj, Timișoara, and Iași. These centers could provide training, mentorship, and perhaps seed grants to student-founded ventures.

Support Accelerators & Incubators Nationwide. We recommend establishing a national network of startup accelerators and incubators, possibly via public-private partnerships. Poland’s use of regional accelerators under the Startup Booster program and Estonia’s network of startup hubs (often backed by Startup Estonia) have been critical in nurturing early-stage companies outside the capital cities. Likewise, Romania should ensure that every major region has at least one well-resourced accelerator that provides mentorship, workspace, and small seed grants to local startups. Public funding (e.g. through EU structural funds or national innovation budgets) can co-finance these programs, alongside industry sponsors. Involving experienced entrepreneurs and investors as mentors is key to impart practical knowledge. Such a network would directly address talent and knowledge gaps by coupling first-time founders with guidance and early funding opportunities close to home.

Founder Development Programs. In addition to educating young potential entrepreneurs, Romania can invest in upskilling its current and aspiring startup founders. Short-form training on topics like product development, fundraising, or scaling a company could be offered regularly (for instance, intensive workshops or evening courses). Furthermore, exchange programs that expose Romanian founders to more mature ecosystems would be highly valuable. Poland and Estonia have leveraged international linkages for their startups – for example, Estonia’s accelerators often connect startups to mentors and investors in Nordic countries, and Poland’s agency PARP has organized programs to help local startups explore foreign markets. Romania could partner with European initiatives (such as EIT Digital or the *Erasmus for Young Entrepreneurs* program) to send founders abroad for limited periods or bring in foreign mentors. The goal is to build human capital and global mindset among Romanian startup founders so they can drive the ecosystem’s growth from within.

5.2. Funding and Investment

Launch a Public-Private Co-Investment Fund. A centerpiece recommendation is for Romania to create a fund-of-funds program similar to Poland’s PFR Ventures. This Romanian public-private fund would deploy public money alongside private venture capital funds and angel investor groups, targeting gaps in seed and Series A financing. The fund should be professionally managed and operate transparently, with clear metrics (e.g. number of startups funded, private capital mobilized) and periodic external evaluations. Romania

has access to substantial EU recovery and cohesion funds which could be channeled into such a program. By structuring it as matching funds – for example, a 1:1 match where for each leu of private investment the fund invests one leu – the program can attract both domestic and international VC firms to invest in Romanian startups. Poland's experience demonstrates that a well-designed co-investment fund can jump-start a dormant VC market by reducing risk and encouraging private players to participate (Brander et al., 2015; PFR Ventures, 2023). If implemented, this fund of funds could dramatically increase the availability of early-stage capital in Romania within a few years.

Incentivize Local Investors (Pensions & Angels). Unlocking domestic capital is crucial. One major opportunity lies in pension fund reform. Romania's large private pension funds currently allocate virtually nothing to venture capital or private equity. The government, together with financial regulators, could allow or encourage a small percentage of pension assets to be invested in VC funds that back Romanian innovation (with appropriate safeguards for risk). Countries like Canada and Israel have successfully directed portions of pension money into tech startups, significantly boosting available capital. In parallel, Romania can introduce tax incentives for individual investors akin to Poland's 50% deduction. For example, offering a personal income tax credit or deduction for accredited angel investments or for individuals investing in approved startup funds would encourage high-net-worth Romanians (and members of the diaspora) to become angel investors. The Business Angels Law of 2015 in Romania provides some tax exemptions on dividends for angel investors, but it is underutilized and could be much more generous. A revised law could include automatic qualification for incentives when an investment is made (to remove red tape) and higher deduction limits. Simplifying the process for angels to syndicate or co-invest (perhaps via an online platform or an "angel co-investment fund" model) would further reduce barriers. Overall, the goal is to stimulate a vibrant local investor base to support Romanian startups at early stages.

Simplify VC Fund Formation and Operations. Romania should also strive to attract more venture fund managers and facilitate the creation of local VC funds. Currently, setting up a venture capital fund or management company in Romania can be administratively cumbersome and time-consuming. The government should streamline regulations in this area—for instance, by introducing a straightforward limited partnership structure for investment funds (aligned with EU norms), reducing minimum capital requirements for management companies, and fast-tracking the licensing process for funds focusing on innovation. Estonia's lean business climate has already drawn some foreign investors to base operations there (even via e-Residency in some cases). Romania could aim to become a similarly attractive base for funds. This might include clarifying the tax treatment of carried interest (the profit share for fund managers) to be competitive – ideally taxing it as capital gains rather than

ordinary income – and ensuring fund management fees and activities are not overregulated. By removing friction in establishing and running funds, Romania can organically increase the pool of venture financing available to local startups. In essence, we want to make it just as easy for a new VC fund to set up in Bucharest or Cluj as it is in Berlin or London.

5.3. Legal and Regulatory Framework

Update the Business Angels Law. As noted, Romania's existing legislation for angel investors (Law 120/2015) offers limited incentives – primarily an exemption on tax for dividends earned from startups, up to a small cap, and some conditions for shares held. This law has seen low uptake. We recommend a substantial update to offer more meaningful benefits to angel investors. This could include allowing angels to deduct a portion of their investment (e.g. 30–50%) from taxable income, as seen in Poland's scheme and in the UK's SEIS/EIS programs, and raising the maximum investment amount that qualifies. More fundamentally, the process should be automatic: any individual investing in a certified startup (or approved fund) should receive the tax benefit without needing complex approvals. By significantly sweetening and simplifying the incentive, Romania can stimulate the emergence of a larger domestic angel community, which is vital for funding very early-stage startups.

Introduce Clear ESOP Legislation. One glaring gap in Romania's startup ecosystem is the lack of a clear, favorable legal framework for employee stock options (ESOPs) and other forms of employee equity participation. In leading startup hubs (from Silicon Valley to Tallinn), stock options are a critical tool that startups use to attract and retain talent when they cannot match corporate salaries. Currently, Romanian startups face ambiguity and potentially high taxes when offering stock options to employees – often such gains could be taxed as regular income at the time of grant or vesting, which is punitive and impractical. We propose that Romania enact legislation defining startup stock option plans and deferring any taxation to the point of sale (when the employee actually realizes monetary gains), and even then taxing those gains at capital gains rates (which are lower) rather than income tax rates. This approach would mirror best practices in other jurisdictions and remove a major disadvantage Romanian startups face in hiring. By enabling employees to share in the upside of growth with minimal upfront tax consequences, Romanian startups could better compete for skilled workers against global tech companies.

Simplify Company Formation and Compliance. Despite improvements in recent years, red tape remains a frequent complaint among Romanian entrepreneurs. It can still take multiple weeks to fully register a new company, often requiring unnecessary steps like notarized documents or newspaper publication of firm registration. Building on the Estonian model (where establishing a company can be done online in a day or two using digital IDs) and even Poland's recent moves to

enable online filings, Romania should move toward fully online, one-day business registration. This means digitizing all required filings, eliminating archaic requirements (e.g. physical stamps or paid-in capital proofs for small startups), and providing default incorporation documents to streamline the process. Furthermore, ongoing compliance such as tax filing, social contributions, and other reporting should be simplified for startups – perhaps through a single online dashboard. As a benchmark, Estonian companies spend on average only ~5 hours per year on corporate tax compliance, versus over 50 hours in Romania (Invest in Estonia, 2021b). Reducing administrative burden not only saves entrepreneurs time and money, but also sends a signal that “Romania is open for business”. The government could set a public goal to significantly improve Romania’s ranking on the World Bank’s Ease of Doing Business indicators (particularly the “Starting a Business” and “Paying Taxes” metrics) within a couple of years, as a way to focus efforts on deregulation and digitization.

Strengthen Intellectual Property (IP) and Insolvency Regimes. Finally, Romania should ensure that its legal framework is supportive of the high-risk, innovation-driven nature of startups. On the IP front, this means streamlining patent and trademark registration processes (perhaps offering expedited review for patents in emerging tech fields), and ensuring that intellectual property developed within research institutions can be easily licensed or spun off to startup companies (so that university or institute researchers can commercialize their innovations without undue hurdles). Additionally, Romania’s insolvency laws should be examined and adjusted to be more “failure-friendly.” In places like the US or Estonia, failing fast and trying again is accepted and facilitated by law – entrepreneurs can go through bankruptcy without lifelong stigma or debt traps. Poland and Estonia have both modernized their insolvency frameworks in recent years to allow quicker restructuring or discharge of debts for failed startups, thereby encouraging risk-taking. Romania could introduce a special fast-track bankruptcy process for startups (with straightforward liquidation or reorganization options and protections for honest entrepreneurs) to give founders a second chance. Consulting with startup community members and legal experts can identify the most onerous legal hurdles currently and prioritize their removal.

By pursuing these recommendations in concert, Romania can create a virtuous cycle like those in Poland and Estonia: educated entrepreneurs launching startups; ample funding options to scale those ventures; and a legal system that makes it easy to start a business, grow it, and, if necessary, exit or even fail without dire consequences. It is crucial that these levers be deployed as part of a coordinated national startup strategy rather than as piecemeal measures. Poland’s success was partly due to having PFR Ventures act as a central node for startup financing, and Estonia’s due to a clear vision of becoming a “startup nation.” Romania should similarly designate a lead agency or task force (perhaps under the Ministry of Economy or Ministry of Research, Innovation and Digitalization)

to drive the startup strategy and ensure cross-ministerial cooperation – aligning efforts in education, finance, and justice ministries under common goals.

6. Conclusion

Poland and Estonia demonstrate that smart, well-designed public policies can indeed catalyze startup ecosystem growth. In both countries, significant surges in startup funding, new company formation, and successful exits closely followed the implementation of targeted policy interventions. Of course, each nation's context differs – Poland leveraged large EU funds and a sizeable internal market, while Estonia capitalized on its digital infrastructure and global openness. Yet the core insight is that government can be an effective facilitator of entrepreneurship when it steps in to fill market gaps (such as early-stage capital shortages or talent deficits) and to remove obstacles (such as bureaucratic hurdles or misaligned incentives).

Romania, now at a similar crossroads, has the opportunity to leapfrog by learning from these models. The recommendations outlined in this paper – from education reforms and startup visas to coinvestment funds and legal tweaks – are not isolated ideas, but components of an integrated approach to jump-start innovation-driven growth. Implementing such changes will require political will and close collaboration between the public and private sectors. The potential payoff, however, is substantial: a more vibrant economy, new high-skilled jobs, and Romania's emergence as a regional hub for tech startups. With its strong technical talent pool and entrepreneurial spirit (as evidenced by many successful Romanian-founded startups abroad), Romania has significant untapped potential that smart policy can help unlock.

In closing, building a thriving startup ecosystem is a long-term journey, but it can be accelerated through data-driven policymaking and openness to learning from peers. By studying what worked in Warsaw and Tallinn and thoughtfully adapting those ideas in Bucharest and Cluj, Romania can avoid reinventing the wheel and instead fast-track its progress. The experiences of Poland and Estonia show that with the right mix of policies, startup success will follow. The time is ripe for Romanian policymakers to act boldly and strategically – if the lessons from these case studies are heeded, Romania could very well become CEE's next startup success story.

References

1. Atomico. 2020. *The State of European Tech 2020*. Atomico and Slush.
2. Brander, James A., Qin Du and Thomas Hellmann. 2015. "The Effects of Government-Sponsored Venture Capital: International Evidence." *Review of Finance* 19(2): 571–618.

3. Colombo, Massimo G., Douglas J. Cumming and Salvatore Vismara. 2016. "Governmental Venture Capital for Innovative Young Firms." *Journal of Technology Transfer* 41(1): 10–24.
4. Czarnitzki, Dirk and Catarina Lopes-Bento. 2014. "Innovation Subsidies: Does the Funding Source Matter for Innovation Intensity and Performance?" ZEW Discussion Paper 14-034, Centre for European Economic Research, Mannheim.
5. Deloitte. 2022. *Romanian Private Equity and Venture Capital Study*. Deloitte Romania & ROPEA.
6. Ghinita, Elena. 2024. "Invest in Moonicorns: CEE Needs More Private Money for Startup Funding." *The Recursive*, 2 October.
7. Groszkowska, Katarzyna. 2024. *Romanian Startup & VC Ecosystem Report*. Vestbee Insights.
8. Invest in Estonia. 2021a. "Fifth of Estonian Startups Founded with Help of Startup Visa Programme." Invest in Estonia, January.
9. Invest in Estonia. 2021b. "Tax Competitiveness Index 2021: Estonia Has the Most Competitive Tax System in the World." Invest in Estonia, November.
10. Isenberg, Daniel. 2010. "The Big Idea: How to Start an Entrepreneurial Revolution." *Harvard Business Review* 88(6): 40–50.
11. Lerner, Josh. 2010. *Boulevard of Broken Dreams: Why Public Efforts to Boost Entrepreneurship and Venture Capital Have Failed – and What to Do About It*. Princeton University Press.
12. Mason, Colin and Ross Brown. 2014. *Entrepreneurial Ecosystems and Growth Oriented Entrepreneurship*. OECD LEED Programme Paper, Paris.
13. OECD. 2022. *What Are the Risks and Rewards of Start-up Visas?* OECD Publishing, Paris.
14. PFR Ventures. 2021. "New Tax Relief: 50 % Deduction for Investors in VC Funds and Business Angels." Polish Development Fund, 2 June.
15. PFR Ventures. 2023. *Investments by PFR Ventures under the SGOP (2017–2023) – Summary*. Polish Development Fund.
16. Tax Foundation. 2021. *International Tax Competitiveness Index 2021*. Tax Foundation, Washington DC.