Colombia's Pension Reform After the Court's Approval: What Changes for Companies and Where the Long-Term Bill Lies

A reading of the new four-pillar system (Law 2381 of 2024), its three competing narratives, and the fiscal impact that will define the coming decade's agenda

Bogotá D.C. · August 2026 | Prepared by the PGA consulting team

On August 25, 2026, the Constitutional Court settled the greatest uncertainty that had hung over Colombian social security since 2024: Law 2381 is, in substance, constitutional. With that ruling, the four-pillar model ceased to be a campaign hypothesis and became the architecture under which Colombians will retire starting April 1, 2027. For those of us who run people, payroll, and compliance functions, the discussion is no longer about being for or against; it is about understanding a system that reorders how each worker contributes and what new obligations the employer takes on.

It is worth saying plainly: the ruling upheld the reform but returned nine articles to the House of Representatives over procedural defects. This is no minor technicality. Those articles govern procedural matters — among them the mechanics of the transfer window — and until Congress corrects them within the thirty-day deadline and the Court validates the fix, much of the fine-grained operation remains on hold. The reform exists and has a date; its regulation is still being written. That distinction is what separates the organizations that prepare in advance from those that will react at the last minute.

In this brief we gather the three narratives now competing to explain the reform, we test their arguments against the available figures, and we dwell on what, in our view, matters most for business planning: the fiscal impact and the challenges the reform leaves the country — and, by extension, companies — over the next twenty to thirty years.

Three Readings of a Single Law

One of the things that most confuses management teams is that there is no single authoritative voice on the reform, but three, and each starts from a different diagnosis. It is worth separating them, because very different expectations about what lies ahead flow from each.

The Official Narrative: Coverage and Equity

The Government and Colpensiones defend the reform as a correction of social justice. The underlying argument is hard to rebut in its premise: today three out of four older adults receive no pension, and the solidarity pillar is designed to deliver a basic income to more than two million people growing old in poverty. To this are added the gender approach — the gradual reduction in the weeks required of women and the credit for each child — and the dismantling of the subsidies that, under the previous scheme, ended up financing the highest pensions with public money. It is the promise of a system that stops rewarding those who already have the most.

The Industry Narrative: The Bill the Young Will Pay

Asofondos and the private administrators — Porvenir, Protección, Colfondos, Skandia — hold the opposite position in language that is more technical than ideological. Their central thesis is that a pay-as-you-go model cannot withstand Colombian demographics: each year there are fewer contributors per retiree, and without real individual savings the system suffocates in the medium term. They warn that the reform shifts the bill onto younger generations by way of a pension liability they project at 224% of GDP, and they object to three concrete losses for the worker: less freedom to choose who manages their money, limits on the inheritance of savings, and a minimum requirement that rises from 1,150 to 1,300 weeks precisely for lower-income contributors. It is the warning that today's equity is paid for with tomorrow's taxes.

The Academic Narrative: Sound Diagnosis, Deferred Decisions

Between the two extremes sits a third view, that of independent analysis. It agrees with the Government that the Law 100 system was dysfunctional and inequitable — they describe it as a "reverse Robin Hood" that charged the disadvantaged to subsidize high pensions — but it faults the reform for having dodged the fundamental decisions. The retirement age was not touched despite rising life expectancy; contribution rates were not adjusted. For this camp, Law 2381 is a cash relief in the short term and a time bomb in the long term, with a future pension debt estimated at 75% of GDP that will sooner or later demand tax reforms. The criticism is not of the purpose, but of the political courage that was missing.

Our reading, from consulting practice, leans toward this third position without dismissing what is valid in the other two. The expansion of coverage is real and socially necessary; the fiscal risk is real as well. The mistake would be to treat them as if one canceled out the other. The reform solves an urgent problem of the present and sows another, larger one, for the future. Understanding that dual nature is the only way to plan with one's feet on the ground.

How the System Is Built

The reform replaces the competition between Colpensiones and the private funds with a scheme of complementarity. Instead of choosing between one regime or the other, the worker contributes in an integrated way according to income level. Four pillars share the task:

Pillar	Who it covers	Where the money comes from	What it delivers
Solidarity	Men from 65 and women from 60 in extreme poverty or vulnerability	General Budget and Pension Solidarity Fund	Basic solidarity income (floor: poverty line)
Semi-contributory	People of pension age with between 300 and 999 weeks	Own contributions plus state subsidy (up to 80% of the minimum wage)	Monthly life annuity
Contributory	Workers with a contribution base income	A 16% contribution (Colpensiones, ACCAI, and Savings Fund)	Integral old-age, disability, or survivor pension
Voluntary	Anyone with additional saving capacity	The worker's own voluntary savings	Supplement to the final amount; allows equivalences

The piece that reorders everything is the threshold of 2.3 minimum wages, close to 2.99 million pesos at 2024 values. Below that cap, contributions go mandatorily to Colpensiones; above it, to the individual savings component. The aggregate effect is a massive reallocation of flows toward the public fund: Colpensiones' annual collection is estimated to rise from 15 to 38 trillion pesos. That is a great deal of money flowing into the State at once, and that is precisely the root of the fiscal debate we address next.

For companies there is also a fundamental change in the role of the administrators. The former AFPs are transformed into Administrators of the Complementary Individual Savings Component (ACCAI) and lose full control over the capital: at the moment of retirement they must liquidate the affiliate's assets and transfer them to Colpensiones, which takes over as sole payer. In practice, private ownership of the savings is extinguished at the end of working life and made subject to the state life-annuity formula. This is not an operational nuance; it redefines the very nature of what a worker accumulates over decades.

The Fiscal Impact: Relief Today, Pressure Tomorrow

Here lies the crux of the matter, and where it is most worth pausing. In the short term the reform produces a cash effect favorable to the Government. By requiring that the first 2.3 minimum wages contribute to the public fund, Colpensiones' revenues multiply, and that allows its deficit to be reduced during the first five years. In numbers: the shortfall that previously had to be covered with taxes amounted to 1.5% of GDP, and with the reform it falls to 0.6% of GDP. On paper, the system breathes.

The problem is that this breathing room is borrowed. Every peso that enters the pay-as-you-go regime today is not savings; it is a future obligation to pay a pension. The model charges now and promises later, and that promise accumulates. The figures handled by both the industry and the Autonomous Fiscal Rule Committee paint a picture that no finance department should ignore:

> **Pension liability projected at 224% of GDP.** This is the private funds' estimate of the total debt the reform leaves the Nation — a burden that will be inherited by the young people now beginning to contribute.
>
> **Future pension debt of 75% of GDP.** The CARF calculates that this value, in today's pesos, is around 1,200 trillion. The savings fund to be administered by the Bank of the Republic would reach, at best, 20% of GDP: a reserve that is necessary but insufficient to cover the commitment.
>
> **A deficit that returns and doubles.** Once the first five years are past, Colpensiones' deficit grows again to reach 4% of GDP, driven by aging and aggravated by labor informality and the automation of employment.

To this picture is added a quieter but equally serious effect: the drawdown of national savings. The country's pension savings, today equivalent to about 30% of GDP, would begin to decline steadily in roughly ten years. By 2052 — when that money will be most needed to pay the pensions of a numerous generation — it would have fallen to around 14% of GDP. And since those savings are one of the main sources of financing for the local capital market, their erosion raises the cost of credit and drains fuel from productive investment. The bill, then, is not paid only by the pensioners of the future; it is paid by the whole economy.

What makes this diagnosis so delicate is that the reform left untouched the parameters that would have corrected the problem at its root. Retirement ages were not adjusted despite rising life expectancy, nor were contribution rates. The gender-equity measures are socially valuable, but their long-term fiscal cost has not been fully quantified. In consulting we tend to warn that an unmeasured risk does not disappear: it only becomes more expensive when it detonates.

The Challenges Ahead and What a Company Should Do

Beyond the figures, the reform faces execution challenges worth confronting head-on, because any of them could affect the operation of payroll functions in 2027.

The Operational Challenge

Colpensiones will have to integrate and reconcile close to 25 million labor histories, a volume that far exceeds its historical capacity. At the same time, the ACCAI platforms and those of the public fund have to synchronize in order to process the transfer window. If that technological integration is not ready in time, the transfer of affiliates could turn into a bottleneck with legal-compliance effects. For companies, this translates into a practical recommendation: do not take for granted that the systems will respond without friction, and anticipate workers' queries about their situation.

The Transfer Window and the Transition Regime

The transition regime is the refuge of legal certainty for those who already have consolidated rights under Law 100. Left outside the reform are women with 750 weeks and men with 900 weeks contributed as of April 1, 2027. Those who meet the weeks but are in the regime that does not suit them may use the transfer window, provided they are within ten years of retirement age and comply with the mandatory dual advisory. It is a decision many employees will make without sufficient information, and one where serious support from the human-resources function makes a real difference.

The Equivalences System

A little-publicized but strategic element is the equivalences system, which allows the capital accumulated in the ACCAI to be converted into missing weeks to complete the pension requirement. It takes on special importance in cushioning the increase in weeks — from 1,150 to 1,300 — that hits the lower-income workers who lose the minimum-pension guarantee of the private scheme. It is worth companies knowing about it, because it directly affects the decisions of their lowest-paid staff.

The Underlying Reading

Law 2381 expands the social protection net and corrects inequities the country had carried for decades. That is an achievement. But it does so by shifting the cost of the adjustment onto future generations through a large pension debt, and without resolving the parameters that sustain the system over time. There is no trade-off here between social profitability and macroeconomic stability in the medium term; there is something more uncomfortable: an intergenerational imbalance that passes the financial bill for today's decisions to the Colombians of tomorrow.

For an organization, the operational conclusion is sober. First, prepare now for the changes in contributions and for supporting workers through the transfer window, without waiting for the regulation of the nine returned articles to be finalized. Second, assume that voluntary savings cease to be a mere vehicle for tax optimization and become the anchor of each employee's wealth stability, and communicate it as such in benefits policies. And third, build into medium-term planning the near certainty that parametric adjustments — age, rates, or both — and probably new tax burdens will come. Not because we want to be pessimists, but because demographics and fiscal arithmetic rarely get it wrong, and planning with that expectation is simply doing our job well.

PGA Consultores Empresariales S.A.S. — Labor Compliance and Risk Consulting Practice