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Introduction

For information (status end-2013):
- Existing procedure for the dissemination of data by scheme to "specific users"
- Consultations of countries in 2013 to simplify the procedure:
  - ok for the majority of countries (26)
  - data sensitivity/confidentiality issues for a few (6)

For discussion: Implementation of the concept of a “scheme”
For discussion: Proposal to disseminate data by scheme in Eurobase (web site)

Early exchanges of views (EEV): 18 countries replied (BE, DE, ES, FR, IT, CY, LV, LT, HU, NL, AT, RO, SI, SK, SE, UK, NO, CH)
Background

- **Legislation** authorises Eurostat to disseminate data by scheme for the Core system and the pension beneficiaries module to “specific users” but these may only publish data after applying grouping of schemes specified by countries.

- **On a practical basis this has been implemented as follows:**
  1. User requests data from Eurostat
  2. Eurostat requests authorisation from countries + groupings info
  3. Countries reply specifying any dissemination (from Eurostat to user) and re-dissemination (from user to the public) restrictions
  4. Eurostat transmits data to the user accordingly

- **Procedure is cumbersome and contradicts the statistical principle of equal treatment of all users.**
Consultation in 2013

- **Growing interest → need to simplify this procedure**
  - Core System: Annual requests from OECD + DG EMPL/SPC-FEE request in June 2013

- **Based on consultations undertaken during 2013, the current situation is as follows:**
  - **26 countries** have agreed to full dissemination of their data by scheme: BE, BG, CZ, DK, DE, EE (only 2007 onwards), IE, FR, HR, IT, CY, LV, LT, HU, MT, NL, AT, PL, RO, FI, SE, UK, IS, NO (only 2008 onwards), CH, RS.
  - **6 countries** have not agreed to full dissemination of their data by scheme: EL, ES, LU, PT, SI, SK → sensitivity/confidentiality reasons.
Dissemination of data by scheme via Eurobase (for 26 countries with no problem)

Eurostat proposes the following four-step implementation strategy:

a) Eurostat will prepare **explanatory notes to guide users to an appropriate interpretation and use of the data** and a list of proposed tables to be included in Eurobase. It will submit these to the countries for comment.

b) Eurostat will prepare a **final draft** of the overall dissemination framework and then submit this to the countries for final comments.

c) Upon approval, Eurostat will **start the process** to add new tables to Eurobase and integrate the new explanatory notes into the metadata.

d) Data by scheme and the corresponding metadata **will be published** on the Eurostat web site. Note: data will be limited to the countries/reference years for which there has been no objection to full dissemination (in principle at least 26 countries).
For decision:

Do countries agree with this four-step strategy?
(Box 3 of DOC SP-2014-06.1)

**EEV:** 18 countries BE, DE, ES, FR, IT, CY, LV, LT, HU, NL, AT, RO, SI, SK, SE, UK, NO, CH
All agree
except CH (new better data source ➔ however creates new problems of confidentiality for 2 schemes)

ES: data by schemes not useful for comparability (social protection systems are different)
Eurostat: agree (see doc): purpose is "better understanding the differences using a comparable framework"

Other comments? OK to go ahead for 25 countries (26-CH)?
6 countries: data sensitivity/confidentiality

- Confidentiality issues ➔ grouping data of certain schemes.
- However, dissemination of data grouped in this way could prejudice future dissemination of the data using other more useful grouping methods.
- During consultations the 6 countries concerned noted that original sources were being consulted to verify the confidentiality of their data.
- If even a very limited part of the data is confirmed to be confidential, this will imply a dramatic modification of the statistical production process and will impact the possibility to use in full modern ICT solutions.
- Eurostat therefore welcomes the efforts being carried out by EL, ES, LU, PT, SI and SK (+CH) to further investigate the confidentiality status of their data.
For information:

EL, ES, LU, PT, SI and SK are invited to update the WG on the progress made with their data sources on confidentiality issues and their plans/expectations for 2014.

(Box 1 of DOC SP-2014-06.1)

EEV: SK: problem has been reduced from 20 to 2 schemes !!!!
+CH: 2 schemes

EL, ES, LU, PT, SI: please update the WG (sensitivity? confidentiality? ➔ huge consequences for ICT facilities)

Info from 2013 consultation:

- LU: problem limited to 4 schemes.
- PT thought a clear picture of the situation could be obtained by the end of 2014.
- SI: general re-assessment of the confidentiality issue was under way.
Other points of consideration

• During consultations the following points were raised:
  o Metadata could be expanded to provide clarifications to appropriate use of data by scheme and explanations addressing differences between national data and ESSPROS data. ➔ OK
  o Detailed data are not available for some schemes. Estimates for these are acceptable but should be documented using metadata and flags. ➔ OK
  o Data by scheme are not particularly helpful for comparison between countries. ➔ OK indeed users instead ask for these data to gain a more concrete and detailed understanding of the aggregated results published at country level. Better understanding the differences in social protection systems but using a comparable framework
  o The concept of “scheme” may have been interpreted and implemented in different ways by different countries. ➔ see analysis
Implementation of “scheme” concept

• A statistical review of the implementation of the concept of a “scheme” was conducted (Doc SP-2014-06.1-Annex)
• The Methodology states (part 1 § 42):
  “a social protection scheme is a distinct body of rules, supported by one or more institutional units, governing the provision of social protection benefits and their financing.”
  “(i) social protection schemes should at all times meet the condition that it must be possible to draw up a separate account of receipts and expenditures”
  “(ii) preferably, social protection schemes are chosen in such a way that they provide protection against a single risk or need and cover a single specific group of beneficiaries.”
Implementation of “scheme” concept

Figure 1: Number of schemes with expenditure on benefits, 2011
In ascending order by GDP per capita (in Euro)
Implementation of “scheme” concept

Figure 2: Average number of functions with expenditure per scheme, 2011

*In ascending order by number of schemes with expenditure*
Implementation of “scheme” concept

Figure 3: Average number of detailed benefit types with expenditure per scheme, 2011

In ascending order by number of schemes with expenditure
Implementation of “scheme” concept

- Further analysis is required for a full assessment.
- There is evidence to suggest that schemes are not delimited in a homogeneous way across countries.
- However, methodology allows for such differences.
- Countries could verify if a more “detailed” implementation of the definition of scheme could be relevant and feasible on a voluntary basis, in some apparently extreme cases (schemes covering more than 6 functions and more than 20 different types of benefits).

  functions (>6): NO, CY, EL, ES, MT, SE, HU, PT, PL, IT, UK, AT, DE, CH, FR
  detailed benefits (>20): NO, CY, EL, ES, SK, PT, CZ, PL, AT, DE, SI, CH, FR

- **EEV: DE: no. IT: maybe (to evaluate). ES: not mandatory.**
For discussion:

Do you have other ideas for further analysis of the concept of "scheme"?

How to proceed for "heterogeneous schemes"?
Bilateral contacts?
PRAGMATIC APPROACH
Thank you

Conclusions:

1) four-step strategy: ok for 25 countries?
2) further investigation about confidentiality for 7 countries (deadline: end 2014?)
3) concept of scheme: possible harmonisation, however gradual and pragmatic medium-long term process