Two Views of Jobs and Separations

• Coasean view of jobs and separations:
  • Efficient bargaining, exploiting all gains from trade

  ⇒ Joint job surplus allocative (firm + worker surplus)

  \[
  \text{Joint Job Surplus} = \text{Inside Values} - \text{Outside Values}
  \]

  ⇒ Separations efficient: joint surplus < 0

• Frictional ("non-Coasean") views of jobs and separations
  • Unilateral worker and firm surpluses are allocative
  • Separations can be inefficient
    Ex: Firm surplus < 0 while worker surplus \(\gg 0\), so joint surplus > 0

• Our paper: empirical test to adjudicate b/w Coasean and frictional views at the separations margin
Testing Between Coasean and Alternative Views

- We study a separations effects of large UIB extension (job surplus ↓)
- Quasi-experiment: UI benefit extension in Austria (REBP)
  - Large increase in maximum benefit duration: 1 → 4 years, starting in 1988
  - Treatment and control regions
  - Sharp age eligibility cutoff (50+)
- **Abolished in 1993**
- Prediction of Coasean view: Post-abolition, surviving matches more resilient in response to any surplus shocks
- Prediction of other view: Post-abolition resilience to worker surplus shifts, but not firm surplus shifts
Coasean View: Separation and Resilience Effects

Jobs: Matches with positive surplus
Benefit increase reduces surplus
Surplus of surviving matches during reform
Abolishing the reform
Coasean View: Separation and Resilience Effects

Abolishing the reform missing mass of marginal matches (with low joint surplus)
Coasean View: Separation and Resilience Effects

Post-abolition resilience to shocks
Preview of Results

I. Does UI-induced boost of nonemployment option lead to separations of marginal matches?
   • 11ppt increase in separations among initially employed (39ppt base)

II. Which matches were dissolved by the policy? (Complier analysis in paper, today just summary)
   • Evidence consistent with low-surplus jobs at the margin (but not definitely informative)
   • Pre-separation attributes: blue-collar jobs in shrinking industries and firms, with freq’t sickness
   • Survey: significant share of worker-sided quits

III. Core test of Coasean vs. alternative view
   • Exploit abolition of reform in 1993
   • Prediction of Coasean view: surviving matches are more resilient
     • Provided some degree of persistence in idiosyncratic surplus
   • Yet, in the data: same resilience among survivors in treatment and control

⇒ Inefficient separations — or efficient, but full “reshuffling” of surplus distribution even after 1 year

One non-Coasean story: wage rigidity + high initial worker surplus, post-abol’n sep’s from firm surplus
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No experience rating

Voluntary quitters eligible for UI (and extension)
  - Four week wait period

Replacement rate: 41-48% of gross income; UIBs untaxed

Level bounded at minimum and maximum amount
1988 Policy Change: Regional Extended Benefit Program (REBP)

- UI benefit extension from max 52 weeks to max 209 weeks
- Active June 1988 to July 1993
- Targeted 28 (out of 100) labor market districts

Eligibility criteria (at unemployment entry):
- Residence in REBP district $\geq$ 6 months
- Older than age 50
- More than 15 years of work experience in last 25 years

Context and policy objectives:
- Original goal: mitigate job loss from steel sector restructuring
- Reform affected all – incl. non-steel – workers in REBP regions
- We exclude steel workers from analysis
The Regional Benefit Extension Program (REBP)
REBP Extended Benefit Duration for Age 50+

Potential Benefit Duration (Weeks)

Age 50+

1988 1989 1993

REBP Non-REBP

Potential Benefit Duration (Weeks)
Second Control Group: Workers Age <50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Benefit Duration (Weeks)</th>
<th>1988</th>
<th>1989</th>
<th>1993</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REBP and Non-REBP Age 40-49</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data and Sample

- Population of matched employer-employee data from Austria
  - Universe of Austrian Social Security Register (ASSD)
- Primary sample: male workers aged 45 to 55, 1987 to 1998
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Control: Fraction Separated from 1988 Job by 1993

Sample: Individuals with job in 1988.
REBP vs. Control: Fraction Separated from '88 Job by '93

Sample: Individuals with job in 1988.
Treatment Effect: Differences

Sample: Individuals with job in 1988.
Quarters Employed 50–55: Differences

Sample: Individuals with job at 49.
Continuous Employment \( \downarrow \approx \) Overall Employment \( \downarrow \)

Sample: Individuals with job at 49.
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4. **Characterizing Jobs Destroyed by the Reform** *(More in Paper)*

5. Test of Coasean View: Post-Abolition Stability of Surviving Jobs
   
   5.1 Conceptual Framework for Coasean Setting
   
   5.2 Structural Estimation
   
   5.3 Alternative Non-Coasean Interpretation
Complier Analysis: Attributes of Incremental REBP Separators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>C - N</th>
<th>C - A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Collar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp. Growth Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp. Growth at Establishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(Growing Establishment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment FE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker FE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Sickness in Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Spell Duration Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences Between Compliers and Always-Separators, and Compliers and Never-Separators
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Conceptual Framework

Job is **feasible** if worker surplus $S^W$ and firm surplus $S^F$:

$$S^W(V^W, w) = V^W_{In} + w - V^W_{Out} \geq 0$$

$$S^F(V^F, w) = V^F_{In} - w - V^F_{Out} \geq 0$$

$V^W = (V^W_{In}, V^W_{Out})$: worker inside job value (e.g. amenities), outside value (e.g. value of unemployment)

$V^F = (V^F_{In}, V^F_{Out})$: firm inside job value (e.g. productivity), outside value (e.g. vacancy)

Coasean bargaining

Parties agree on $w \in [w^W, w^F]$, which implements bilaterally efficient allocation

⇒ **Joint surplus** is the allocative surplus concept

$$S(V) = \underbrace{S^W(V^W, w) + S^F(V^W, w)}_{S^W(V^W, w) + S^F(V^W, w)}$$

Coasean separation probability for a job $V$:

$$\bar{d}(V) = \int_{V'} 1\{S(V') < 0\}k(V'|V)dV'$$

$k(., .)$: Markov process guiding evolution of $V$
REBP-Induced Separations

**REBP shock** hits treatment group \((Z = 1)\), but not control group \((Z = 0)\)

\[
\varepsilon_b^W = V_{\text{Out}}^W (b_0 + \Delta b) - V_{\text{Out}}^W (b_0) > 0
\]

Surplus level gross of aggregate shock \(\varepsilon'\):

\[
\tilde{S}(V') = S(V', \varepsilon') - \varepsilon'
\]

**Separation share**:

\[
\delta^Z = \int_V \int_{V'} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{S}(V') < Z \times \varepsilon_b^W\}} k(V'|V) dV' f^Z_{\text{pre}}(V) dV
\]

\[\tilde{d}(V, Z \times \varepsilon_b^W)\]

\(f^Z_{\text{pre}}\): distribution of job values pre-REBP — Assume \(f^1_{\text{pre}} = f^0_{\text{pre}}\)

**Treatment effect**:

\[
\delta^1 - \delta^0 = \int_V \int_{V'} \mathbf{1}_{\{0 \leq \tilde{S}(V') < \varepsilon_b^W\}} k(V'|V) dV' f^0_{\text{pre}}(V) dV
\]

Marginal jobs, \(M\)
Always-Separators  Compliers or Marginal Matches  Never-Separators

38.5% 10.6% 50.8%

$\delta^0$  $\delta^1 - \delta^0$  $1 - \delta^1$  $\tilde{S}(V')$
Surplus distribution at the end of REBP

\[ \delta^0 \quad 0 \quad \delta^1 - \delta^0 \quad \varepsilon^W_b \quad 1 - \delta^1 \quad \tilde{S}(V') \]

\[ 38.5\% \quad 10.6\% \quad 50.8\% \]

\[ 17.3\% \quad 82.7\% \quad 100\% \]
Surplus distribution RIGHT ATTER ABOLITION OF REBP
Post-REBP Separations

Separation share:

\[ \Delta^Z = \int_{V'} \int_{V''} \left\{ \tilde{S}(V'') < \varepsilon'' \right\} k(V'' | V') dV'' f^Z(V') dV' \]

\[ \tilde{d}(V'; \varepsilon'') \]

Now \( f^1(V') \neq f^0(V') \) due to REBP!

Difference in separation rates driven by composition differences from extraction of marginal jobs:

\[ \Delta^1 - \Delta^0 = \int_{V'} \tilde{d}(V'; \varepsilon'') \left[ f^1(V') - f^0(V') \right] dV' \]
Post-REBP Resilience: General Case

• To assess data, we construct benchmark model for predicted separations:

\[
\Delta^1 = \int_{V'} \tilde{d}(V', \varepsilon'') f^1(V') dV' \\
= \int_{V' \in M} \tilde{d}(V', \varepsilon'') f^1(V') dV' + \int_{V' \notin M} \tilde{d}(V', \varepsilon'') f^1(V') dV' \\
= 0 + \int_{V' \notin M} \tilde{d}(V', \varepsilon'') f^0(V') dV' \ast \left[ \frac{1 - \delta^0}{1 - \delta^1} \right] \\
= \frac{1 - \delta^0}{1 - \delta^1} \left[ \int_{V' \notin M} \tilde{d}(V', \varepsilon'') f^0(V') dV' \pm \int_{V' \in M} \tilde{d}(V', \varepsilon'') f^0(V') dV' \right] \\
= \frac{1 - \delta^0}{1 - \delta^1} \left[ \Delta^0 - \int_{V' \in M} \tilde{d}(V', \varepsilon'') f^0(V') dV' \right]
\]
Post-REBP Resilience: Case of No Idiosyncratic Shocks

\[ \Delta^1(\varepsilon'') = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } \varepsilon'' \leq \varepsilon_b^W \\
\frac{1 - \delta^0}{1 - \delta^1} \left[ \Delta^0(\varepsilon'') - \frac{\delta^1 - \delta^0}{1 - \delta^0} \right] & \text{if } \varepsilon'' > \varepsilon_b^W 
\end{cases} \]

\[ \Delta^1 = \max \left\{ 0, \frac{1 - \delta^0}{1 - \delta^1} \left[ \Delta^0 - \frac{\delta^1 - \delta^0}{1 - \delta^0} \right] \right\} \]
Post-REBP Resilience: Case of No Idiosyncratic Shocks

\[ \Delta S(b, \Delta b) \]

**SEPARATIONS**

**SIZE OF SUBSEQUENT SURPLUS SHOCK**

**FORMER CONTROL GROUP**

**FORMER TREATMENT GROUP**
Predicted Post-REBP Co-movement of Separation Rates — By Cohort

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Separation Rate,} \\
\text{Treatment Group } & \Delta^1 \\
& \frac{1 - \delta^0}{1 - \delta^1} \\
\text{Separation Rate,} \\
\text{Control Group } & \Delta^0
\end{align*}
\]
Predicted Separations by 1995 for 1988-93 Job Stayers

Stayer definition: in same establishment from 1988 through 1994
Track separations through 1995
Predicted vs. Actual Separations by 1995 for 1988-94 Job Stayers

Stayer definition: in same establishment from 1988 through 1994
Track separations through 1995
Predicted vs. Actual vs. Control Sep’s by 1995 for 1988-94 Job Stayers

Stayer definition: in same establishment from 1988 through 1994
Track separations through 1995

Stayer definition: in same establishment from 1988 through 1994
Track separations through 1995
### Labor Demand Shocks: Difference by Tercile of Industry Emp. Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1933q3</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938q3</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943q3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948q3</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stayer definition: in same establishment from 1988 through 1994
Track separations through 1995
Two-digit NACE
Labor Demand Shocks: Establishment-Level “Hockey-Sticks”

![Graph showing the relationship between annual separation rate and annual employment growth. The graph illustrates a downward trend in separation rate with increasing employment growth, indicating a negative correlation.](image-url)
Labor Demand Shocks: Establishment-Level "Hockey-Sticks"
Battery of Other Tests

- Controlling for shifts of *within-cohort* age composition
- Comparing distribution of the age of separators during *mass lay-offs* in each region
- Estimating relationship of separations and *industry growth rates* (Austria, also instrumenting with German rates)
- Comparing ages at first separation and months of continuous employment
- Using placebos for pre-REBP period
- Cell-based analysis of industry-occupation-specific shocks
Reconciling Patterns — $\Delta_1(\varepsilon'') = \Delta_0(\varepsilon'') \forall \varepsilon''$ — with Coasean Model

\[
\Delta_1(\varepsilon'') = \Delta_0(\varepsilon'')
\]

\[
\Leftrightarrow \int_{\mathbf{V}' \in M} \tilde{d}(\mathbf{V}', \varepsilon'') f^1(\mathbf{V}') d\mathbf{V}' + \int_{\mathbf{V}' \notin M} \tilde{d}(\mathbf{V}', \varepsilon'') \frac{f^1(\mathbf{V}')}{1 - \delta^0} d\mathbf{V}' = \int_{\mathbf{V}' \in M} \tilde{d}(\mathbf{V}', \varepsilon'') f^0(\mathbf{V}') d\mathbf{V}' + \int_{\mathbf{V}' \notin M} \tilde{d}(\mathbf{V}', \varepsilon'') f^0(\mathbf{V}') d\mathbf{V}'
\]

Av. sep. rate for the marginals

Av. sep. rate for the inframarginals

\[
\Leftrightarrow \int_{\mathbf{V}' \in M} \tilde{d}(\mathbf{V}', \varepsilon'') f^0(\mathbf{V}') \left[ \frac{1 - \delta^0}{\delta^1 - \delta^0} \right] d\mathbf{V}' = \int_{\mathbf{V}' \notin M} \tilde{d}(\mathbf{V}', \varepsilon'') f^0(\mathbf{V}') \left[ \frac{1 - \delta^0}{1 - \delta^1} \right] d\mathbf{V}'
\]

Av. sep. rate for the marginals

Av. sep. rate for the inframarginals

\[
\Leftrightarrow \int_{\mathbf{V}' \in M} \int_{\mathbf{V}''} 1\{\tilde{S}(\mathbf{V}'') < \varepsilon''\} k(\mathbf{V}'', \mathbf{V}') \hat{f}(\mathbf{V}'') d\mathbf{V}' d\mathbf{V}'' = \int_{\mathbf{V}' \notin M} \int_{\mathbf{V}''} 1\{\tilde{S}(\mathbf{V}'') < \varepsilon''\} k(\mathbf{V}'', \mathbf{V}') \hat{f}(\mathbf{V}'') d\mathbf{V}' d\mathbf{V}''
\]

Av. sep. rate for the marginals

Av. sep. rate for the inframarginals
Predicted Post-REBP Comovement of Separation Rates

\[ \Delta^1 \text{ Separation Rate, Treatment Group} \]

\[ \Delta^0 \text{ Separation Rate, Control Group} \]

\[ \frac{1 - \delta^0}{1 - \delta^1} \]

\[ \frac{\delta^1 - \delta^0}{1 - \delta^0} \]
Horse Race: Structural Estimation

• Let the data put weight on these two extreme models

• Structural relationship between cell-level separation rates in formerly treated and control regions:

\[
\Delta^1_i = (1 - \kappa) \times \Delta^0_i + \kappa \times \max \left\{ 0, \frac{1 - \delta^0_i}{1 - \delta^1_i} \cdot \Delta^0_i - \frac{\delta^1_i - \delta^0_i}{1 - \delta^1_i} \right\}
\]

\( \kappa \): weight on persistence model – “which fraction of cells follow which model?”

• where \( \delta^0_i, \delta^1_i \) are cell-specific REBP-period measured separation rates

\( \Delta^0_i \): younger cohorts in REBP region in the same industry-occupation (blue/white collar) cell

• Not treated by REBP

• Still contain marginal matches

• Exposed to similar industry-occupation-level surplus shocks

• Non-linear model with measurement error (due to idiosyncratic shocks). Solution: GMM using procedure from Schennach (2012) to resolve measurement error.
## Horse Race: Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2-Digit Industry × Occupation Cells</th>
<th>4-Digit Industry × Occupation Cells</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \hat{\kappa} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.0464</td>
<td>-0.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.087)</td>
<td>(0.077)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI (Upper Limit)</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( N )</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternative Interpretation: Non-Coasean Setting

- Which frictional model consistent with the data?
  - Like Tolstoy’s unhappy families: each frictional setting is inefficient in its own way
  - Wage rigidity in response to (nonemployment) outside option shifts (Jäger, Schoefer, Young, Zweimüller 2018)

⇒ Prevents efficient (re-)bargaining
Conceptual Framework — Non-Coasean Setting

Job is **feasible** if worker surplus $S^W$ and firm surplus $S^F$:

$$S^W(V^W, w) = V^W_{In} + w - V^W_{Out} \geq 0$$

$$S^F(V^F, w) = V^F_{In} - w - V^F_{Out} \geq 0$$

**Coasean Bargaining Friction: Wage Rigidity**

Parties agree on $w \in [w^W, w^F]$, which implements bilaterally efficient allocation

⇒ **Joint surplus** Unilateral surpluses are the allocative surplus concepts

$$S(V) = S^W(V^W, w) + S^F(V^F, w)$$

**Non-Coasean separation probability** for a job $V$:

$$\tilde{d}(w, V, \varepsilon') = \int_{(w', V')} 1\left(\tilde{S}^W(w', V') < \varepsilon^W' \lor \tilde{S}^F(w', V') < \varepsilon^F'\right) k((w', V')|(w, V))d(w', V')$$

$k(.,.)$: Markov process guiding evolution of $(w, V)$
Coasean Bargaining

Quits

Layoffs

Mutual
Separations

Feasible Jobs

Gross [Net] of Wage Worker Surplus $V_{in}^w - V_{Out}^w [\pm w]$

Gross [Net] of Wage Firm Surplus $V_{in}^f - V_{Out}^f [\pm w]$

$(0,0)$
Initial REBP Effect — Coasean Model

\[ V_{in} - V_{out} \]

Gross Net of Wage Worker Surplus

In Out \(+w\)

Gross Net of Wage Firm Surplus

In Out \(-w\)

Quits

Layoffs

Mutual Separations

Feasible Jobs

\( -\epsilon_b < 0 \)

\( W < 0 \)
Post-REBP — Coasean Model

Gross [Net] of Wage Worker Surplus $V_{in} - V_{out} + w$

Gross [Net] of Wage Firm Surplus $V_{in} - V_{out} - w$

(0,0)

Quits
Layoffs
Mutual Separations

Feasible Jobs

$\varepsilon W' = 0 < 0$

$\varepsilon F' = 0 < 0$

Former Treatment Group

Former Control Group
Initial REBP Effect: — Non-Coasean Model: Initially High Worker Surplus
Post-REBP — Non-Coasean Model: Largely Firm Surplus Shocks

Quits : Feasible Jobs

\( \varepsilon^w = X < 0 \)

\( \varepsilon^f = X < 0 \)

Gross [Net] of Wage Worker Surplus \( V_{in} - V_{out} [w] \)

Gross [Net] of Wage Firm Surplus \( V_{in} - V_{out} [-w] \)

(0,0)

Mutual Separations

Layoffs

Feasible Jobs

Former Treatment Group

Former Control Group
Predicted Post-REBP Comovement of Separation Rates

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Separation Rate,} & \quad \text{Treatment Group} \, \Delta^1 \\
\text{Control Group} & \, \Delta^0
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Non-Coasean, Firm Shock} & \, \varepsilon^f_0 \\
\text{Non-Coasean, Worker Shock} & \, \varepsilon^w_0 = \text{Coasean, Any Shock} \, \varepsilon^f_0, \varepsilon^w_0
\end{align*}
\]
Predicted Post-REBP Comovement of Separation Rates

**WORKER Surplus Shocks**

**FIRM Surplus Shocks**
Horse Race: Two Interpretations

\[ \Delta_i^1 = (1 - \kappa) \times \begin{cases} \Delta_i^0 & \text{Coasean & Reshuffling} \\ \Delta_i^0 & \text{Non-Coasean & Firm Shocks} \end{cases} + \kappa \times \max \left\{ 0, \frac{1 - \delta_i^0}{1 - \delta_i^1} \cdot \Delta_i^0 - \frac{\delta_i^1 - \delta_i^0}{1 - \delta_i^1} \right\} \]

\( \kappa \): weight on persistence Coasean model or Non-Coasean/Firm Shocks
### Horse Race: Two Interpretations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2-Digit Industry × Occupation Cells</th>
<th>4-Digit Industry × Occupation Cells</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \hat{\kappa} )</td>
<td>-0.0464 -0.123 -0.184 -0.302</td>
<td>0.033 -0.0367 -0.074 -0.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Upper Limit)</td>
<td>(0.087) (0.077) (0.088) (0.081)</td>
<td>(0.046) (0.055) (0.063) (0.064)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>0.127 0.029 -0.010 -0.141</td>
<td>0.124 0.072 0.050 -0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>109 109 109 109</td>
<td>275 275 275 275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Complier Analysis: Attributes of Incremental REBP Separators

Differences Between Compliers, Always-Separators, and Never-Separators
Conclusion

I. Does UI-induced boost of nonemployment value lead to separations among marginal jobs?
   - 11ppt increase in separations among initially employed (39ppt base)

II. Which matches were dissolved by the policy? (More in paper)
   - Evidence consistent with low-surplus jobs at the margin, but not definitely informative
   - Pre-separation attributes: blue-collar jobs in shrinking industries and firms, with freq’t sickness
   - Survey: significant share of worker-sided quits

III. Core test of Coasean vs. alternative view
   - Exploit abolition of reform in 1993
   - Prediction of Coasean view: surviving matches are more resilient
     - Provided some degree of persistence in idiosyncratic surplus
   - Yet, in the data: same resilience among survivors in treatment and control

⇒ Inefficient separations — or efficient, but full “reshuffling” of surplus distribution even after 1 year

One non-Coasean story: wage rigidity + high initial worker surplus, post-abol’n sep’s from firm surplus