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# Introduction

This annex draws together of the findings of the TiPSE project in terms of implications for the improvement of monitoring of patterns of poverty and social exclusion in Europe. It begins with a description of the development of procedures to monitor poverty and social exclusion in conjunction with European social and cohesion policy. It describes the indicators currently in use, and their strengths and weaknesses. It then summarises the findings of the project with regard to the practicalities of mapping patterns of income poverty, and of social exclusion. This leads to recommendations for future development of data collection and indicators. It concludes by reflecting upon the implications of the policy recommendations of Annex 10, and developing a specific set of actions intended to deliver a set of social exclusion indicators reflecting the full breadth of the concept as a sound basis for more targeted interventions.

# The process of monitoring and evaluation of EU social and cohesion policies

TiPSE has touched upon two complex policy areas; on the one hand social and employment policies, and on the other cohesion (regional) policies. It also relates, to some extent, to rural development policies. These policy areas have their own monitoring tools and procedures, with a number of similarities and differences.

Starting with similarities, monitoring is embedded in all these policies within broader implementation contexts. It is a procedural task, carried out within the framework of theme-specific reporting on the implementation of the policies concerned. The process and content of reporting, and the indicators used, are regulated by guidelines issued by the relevant bodies, (Commission of the European Communities 2003, 2005, 2008, European Commission, DG Regional Policy, DG Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities 2012, Social Protection Committee 2012b, 2012c)

Synthetic reports are issued annually. The annual report of Social Protection Committee covers the social situation in Europe and the impacts of the interventions of the member states (European Union 2014b). The Commission’s Strategic Report, issued for the first time in 2010, reports to the European Parliament and the Council on the achievements of joint development efforts (European Commission 2013). Synthetic reports are elaborated by members of the working staff of the Commission and based on annual reports of the member states, National Social Reports (NSR), on the one hand, and Annual Implementation Reports (AIR), on the other. Timelines and division of labour between EU and MS are detailed in a recently issued Commission guideline for monitoring and evaluation (European Commission 2014, see also Appendix 1). National Reform Programs[[1]](#footnote-1) are also evaluated by both branches of reporting. Evaluators of social and cohesion policies are assisted by networks of independent experts who evaluate national reports on a year-by-year basis. Reports are evaluated individually by social policy experts whilst a synthetic annual report is prepared by cohesion policy experts.

Carefully elaborated and commonly agreed sets of indicators are equally key components of monitoring and evaluation in both policy areas, though the indicators themselves are – of course – different. Peer reviewing is also part of the procedure aiming at mutual learning by comparing, sharing and interpreting best-practices of policy tools applied in member states.

Differences in monitoring procedures derive partly from the nature of the policy fields being monitored; another part is related to the ‘maturity’ of the processes and institutions. The Open Method of Communication (OMC) as a framework and a tool for coordinating social policies of the Union within a field otherwise under national responsibility, was founded in the year of 2000 during the Lisbon Council meeting (Lisbon European Council 2000). The first set of commonly agreed indicators (Laeken indicators, see Appendix 2,) was issued in 2001 (Commission of the European Union, Eurostat 2003) The Social Protection Committee (SPC) was established by the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU (Article 160) in 2004 as the most important coordinating body of social policies. It monitors social protection policies of the member states and reports on social inclusion, health, long term care and pensions, under the OMC. The SPC also issues reports and country specific recommendation in the context of the European Semester (For further information see <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=758> )

The OMC was streamlined between 2006 and 2008 with the active participation of the Indicator Sub-Group (ISG) of SPC responsible for updating and developing the entire set of indicators. 2008 was the year when the so called “overarching” indicators were issued (Appendix 3) (Commission of the European Communities 2008). The OMC indicators, including overarching ones, do not produce regional data at all except one indicator that measures overall regional disparities within regions, which is available at NUTS 2 and NUTS 3 levels. (Indicator no 13 of overarching indicators called Regional disparities measured by a coefficient of variation of employment rates.)

The 2012 the Social Protection Performance Monitor (SPPM) was issued by the Indicator Subgroup of Social Protection Committee (SPC) in 2012 (Social Protection Committee 2012c.) as a response to the request of the 2011 EPSCO[[2]](#footnote-2)[1] council meeting to make further efforts to improve the mechanisms for the implementation of National Reform Programs (NRPs), country specific recommendations and Euro Plus Pact[[3]](#footnote-3) commitments within the area of employment, labour market and social protection. SPPM aims at connecting the EU 2020 targets with indicators of the three strands of the OMC[[4]](#footnote-4). The new outputs were published first in 2013 as parts of the annual report of the SPC for 2012, and further developed in the next year. (Appendix 4) Detailed country profiles based on the so called ‘dashboard’ indicators are also part of the statistical Annex of the annual reports. (European Union 2014b)

Cohesion policy is one of the European Union’s “hard” and common policies co-financed by the Community and the member states, targeting territorial cohesion. Therefore, the primary goal in case of cohesion policy is to monitor and evaluate the achievements of the commonly approved policy goals and instruments framed by the hierarchy of programming documents, and supported by one or more the European Social and Investment Funds. In this context, a toolkit has been developed to measure and interpret development efforts and their impacts. The broader assessment of the impacts of policy interventions is regularly performed by the Directorate General for Economic and Financial Affairs (DG EFCIN), which is responsible for developing guidelines and developing policy proposals.

The monitoring procedure within DG Regional Policy was crystallised in the 2000-2006 programming period, when the set of Commonly Agreed Indicators was composed (Appendix 5). (European Commission DG Regional Policy and Cohesion 2006) The above mentioned scheme of reporting was instituted during the 2007-2013 programming period. Cohesion reports are issued every three years (the last is the 6th of July 2014 – European Union 2014a) with midterm progress reports in between. They are the most important synthetic documents dealing with territorial processes and progress made in terms of economic and social cohesion of Europe.

# Poverty and Social Exclusion indicators disseminated by Eurostat

Monitoring of the complex phenomenon of poverty and social exclusion Eurostat relies on two Europe-wide surveys, the Statistics on Income and Living Conditions (SILC) and Labour Force Survey (LFS). The most important advantage of using survey data derives from their more complete harmonisation and strong relevance (adequacy) concerning the aspects of poverty and social exclusion. However, the coverage of different aspects of P&SE (the domains and dimensions defined in Annex 1 and Annex 6), at least in case of published indicators – is patchy and unbalanced: For example, there are no indicators relating to political participation. The other disadvantages of relying on survey data are related to limitations concerning territorial detail. Since financial resources are usually limited, the size of national samples allows for NUTS 2 analysis at best, and samples vary in size among the member states. Thus full NUTS 2 level data availability is restricted to the LFS, whilst SILC allows for NUTS 2 indicators only in the limited number of countries (detailed below).

The four survey-based key indicators which are the most relevant from the point of view of TiPSE themes, are derived from EU-SILC data:

1. At risk of poverty rate (ARoP [ilc\_li41])[[5]](#footnote-5).
2. Share of people living in households with very low work intensity [ilc\_lvhl21][[6]](#footnote-6).
3. Severe material deprivation [ilc\_mddd21][[7]](#footnote-7).
4. At risk of poverty rate or social exclusion – hereinafter ARoPE, which combines the first three [ilc\_peps11])[[8]](#footnote-8).

Together with ‘Life expectancy at a given exact age by gender’ [demo\_r\_mlifexp] the indicators above make up the group of Eurostat ‘Inclusive growth indicators’.

All three indicators which make up the Eurostat AROPE index align with the first domain of TiPSE definition of social exclusion. As such the AROPE index could be viewed as relatively narrow, covering only part of the spectrum of social exclusion phenomena. However this apparent restriction is almost certainly a consequence of data constraints, rather than underlying theory. It seems likely that there is an implicit assumption of an association between the first domain and the other three domains (and constituent dimensions) of social exclusion. The relationship would probably look like this: if people are virtually jobless, severely deprived and poor, they are likely excluded from other amenities of the society (access to services), they also probably live in disadvantaged neighbourhoods (social environment) and all these negative aspects confine them in terms of political participation. The problem with this assumption is that the mapping of proxy variables for social exclusion which is described in Section 4.2 suggests that the different aspects of social exclusion are in fact quite poorly spatially correlated. Different dimensions of exclusion seem to have different spatial distributions, and they are not necessarily closely related to income poverty, as measured by the AROP rate.

Thus the findings of the TiPSE project, especially the case studies (Annexes 2-3), (which highlighted the diversity of social exclusion processes), and the exercises in mapping indicators of social exclusion (Annexes 6 and 8), highlight the narrow focus of the key Eurostat indicators upon income poverty and material deprivation. Other aspects of exclusion, and their specific spatial distributions, are not captured. This could perhaps be addressed by a broadening of the remit of the SILC survey, or perhaps the development of a dedicated survey specifically designed to reveal exclusion in terms of the full set of domains and dimensions of social exclusion. To a limited extent, and on an irregular basis these are addressed by surveys such as the Eurobarometer[[9]](#footnote-9), or the European Social Survey[[10]](#footnote-10).

The second aspect where there is scope for improvement in monitoring of P&SE is in terms of regional disaggregation. NUTS 2 level availability for the EU SILC-based indicators is restricted to nine countries (Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia, Italy, Spain, Ireland, Sweden, Norway, Finland partly), NUTS 1 level data are published for four member states (Hungary, Greece, the Netherlands and Poland) whilst for five countries only NUTS 0 level data is available either for 2012 or 2013 (France, Germany, Croatia, UK, Portugal). Ensuring availability at NUTS-2 of a wider range of P&SE indicators through larger SILC samples would be very beneficial, but has so far not proved possible, presumably due to financial constraints. The Eurobarometer and ESS surveys have a similar limited, and inconsistent (between countries) degree of regional disaggregation.

# Measuring poverty and social exclusion, approaches in TiPSE

In this section we turn from reviewing the strengths and weaknesses of existing monitoring of poverty and social exclusion, to consider what opportunities are revealed and lessons learned, by the mapping tasks carried out within the context of TiPSE. The first of these focused on at-risk-of-poverty (ARoP) rate maps (Annex 5 and 7), whilst the second explored spatial patterns of social vulnerabilities which may be assumed to be associated with a risk of social exclusion (Annex 6 and Annex 8).

## Poverty Mapping (Annexes 5 and 7)

The challenge of poverty mapping was to provide ARoP rate maps at a higher level of geographical detail (NUTS 3) than is available directly from the SILC database (i.e the Eurostat data considered in the previous section). In the Nordic countries, together with a few elsewhere in Europe, the solution is a relatively simple one, since NUTS 3 ARoP rates may be derived directly from administrative registers and databases maintained by the national governments. Elsewhere, since current sample sizes and regional samples are generally an insuperable barrier to deriving more detailed ARoP data directly from the SILC, a number of estimation strategies were employed. These ranged in sophistication from a purpose-made regression modelling procedure, based on a combination of (SILC) survey data and Census microdata, devised by the World Bank (PovMap), through area-based regression models to simple univariate apportionment procedures.

The lessons learned from this exercise, focussing on ways in which income poverty may be more closely monitored at a regional level, beginning with the “ideal” solution, and progressing towards the least demanding, are as follows:

1. By far the most effective way to monitor regional variations in income poverty is to make use of existing administrative databases relating to income, which all but a few countries must maintain for the purpose of taxing income. Of course there are considerable data security issues to be addressed in order to ensure anonymity, but these should not be insuperable for NUTS 3 regions, which with one or two exceptions have populations of a hundred thousand or more. Our first recommendation would therefore be to explore the potential to role out, across the EU, of Nordic-style income register databases. This process should incorporate guidelines to ensure harmonisation, and should incorporate NUTS 3 identifiers as part of a standard data architecture. The main disincentive associated with this “ideal” solution would of course be the cost of implementation, especially in those parts of the EU where national taxation systems are already struggling to fulfil their responsibilities in the context of austerity programmes. However, in the light of the increasingly widespread preference for register-based databases instead of Population Censuses, and the fact that income is naturally more easy to quantify than many aspects of social exclusion, there is a sense in which such a move would be “going with the flow”.
2. A second solution would be to attempt to ensure that those countries unable to deliver register data should provide estimates based upon the World Bank PovMap method. This would probably result in the most accurate regional estimates which are achievable in the absence of full register data. Experience in Task 2.5 of the TiPSE project suggests that the main obstacles to be overcome would be; (a) ensuring that EU SILC samples were large enough to have acceptable sampling errors at NUTS 2, (b) availability of Census microdata, for socio-economic covariates, with adequate samples at NUTS 3, and (c) achieving a match between the definitions of the SILC and Census variables, and category compatibility if the latter is presented in a categorical form. Further issues to consider are the relative paucity of socio-economic covariates in the SILC database, and the tendency for many European countries to replace their conventional population census with a combination of register data and sample surveys. All things considered the obstacles to this approach are formidable, and we do not feel able to recommend it as a Europe-wide approach to generating ARoP rates.
3. Area-based regression models are probably a more practicable approach to estimating regional ARoP rates, and the best alternative to the use of register data. They are much less demanding in terms of raw data than the PovMap approach, and at the same time open up a broad range of possibilities in terms of socio-economic covariates. The recent development of the Eurostat Census Hub, with its standardised hypermatrices[[11]](#footnote-11) suggests that it would be feasible to develop a systematic approach, based upon a fixed set of covariates. Such an approach would only, however, work if SILC data on disposable income data were available for NUTS 2 regions, and in countries where there are a significant number (at least ten) of such regions.
4. Simple apportionment procedures, (such as those used by TiPSE researchers in a few countries for which none of the data requirements for (a)-(c) above were met), cannot be recommended as a routine approach, since the margin of error is likely to be unacceptable.

To summarise, the recommendation is to move to a register-based approach to ARoP rate data provision as soon as is practicable and affordable. This is especially important for countries with relatively few NUTS 2 regions, where area-based models are problematic. In countries with larger numbers of NUTS 2 regions area-based regression models are a good alternative, and the potential for a standardised approach, based upon variables from the Eurostat Census hub hypermatrices should be explored.

One final point, relating to the definition of the AROP rate indicator, should be made. Both the TiPSE case studies, and recent research on Minimum Income Standards have highlighted the fact that poverty is not determined solely by levels of income. There also seem to be substantial geographical variations in the cost of living. Already there have been attempts to take account of urban housing costs through “after housing cost” variants of the AROP rate. However general living costs (heating, travel, food etc) are often significantly higher in rural areas, especially remote, insular or sparsely populated ones. In order to better understand this phenomenon it is suggested that the EU-SILC could be developed to include the cost of a basket of goods and services.

## Social Exclusion Mapping (Annexes 6 and 8)

The other mapping endeavour was based on proxy indicators. In this case researchers were challenged by the complexity of the phenomenon that was to be operationalised, given that social exclusion is a relational, process-oriented and multifaceted phenomenon as the theoretical paper of Task 2.1 conceptualised (Annex 1). During the operationalization phase sixteen dimensions subsumed under four overarching domains of social exclusion (earning a living, access to services, social environment, political participation) were identified by the project team with the help of the literature on the same subject (Ministry of Labour 2006, UNDP 2011). These dimensions, being in some cases in causal relationship with one another (like educational attainment and income or employment/unemployment status of people) were to be covered by NUTS 3 level proxy indicators. (For a detailed picture see Annex 6) However, a number of constraints regarding the availability of data limited the optimal coverage of social exclusion with relevant indicators. The most important constraint was the scarcity of accessible and reliable data across member states.

### The Social Exclusion Database

In the initial phase of operationalising SE sixteen dimensions under four domains were proposed. From these five were subsequently omitted due to lack of data. The dimensions which were not operationalised were:

* one from the domain ‘Access to services’
  + ‘Transport and communication’
* two from the ‘Social environment’ domain
  + crime and safety
  + municipal income and municipal spending on social protection
* two from the Political participation’ domain
  + voters turn up at elections
  + civic engagement

Omitted dimensions contributed to the dominance of data relating to the ‘Earning a living’ domain. Data was collected initially for 2001, and then later, as data became available, for 2011. Imbalances which characterised the 2001 database were to a degree corrected during the 2011 round of data collection when the range of ‘Employment’ indicators was narrowed down considerably (from 27 to 4). Feasibility reasons also supported the narrowing process of the scope of collected data as a result of the extremely short period of time for accessing, collecting and processing data.

The grouping of indicators of social exclusion was finalised as the below table illustrates.

Table 1: Number of indicators 2001 and 2011 by Domain and Dimension

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Domain identified by Task 2.1* | *Dimension recommended by Task 2.6* | *Number of indicators (2001)* | *Number of indicators (2011)* |
| Earning a living | Income earned by tax payers | 2 | 2 |
| Employment | 27 | 4 |
| Access to basic services | Health | 3 | 3 |
| Education | 2 | 2 |
| Housing | 6 | 3 |
| Social environment | Age | 3 | 3 |
| Ethnic composition | 1 | 1 |
| Immigrants | 1 | 1 |
| Household structure | 4 | 2 |
| Political participation | Citizenship | 1 | 1 |

The ten dimensions of social exclusion under the four domains (Earning a living, Access to services, Social environment, Participation) fixed in the first phase of implementation provided the project team with a firm framework of reference throughout the subsequent phases of the project not only during the course of collection of raw data and indicator-setting, but also when macro-regional and Europe-wide analyses were performed.

The decision to omit dimensions for which harmonised data was not accessible also implied that the research team decided to limit itself to harmonised Eurostat or census data. From this stage, statistical information other than census data collected by national statistical offices was excluded from the data collection exercise covering the ESPON space. The exploration and usage of national statistics was instead explored in the qualitative section of the project (case studies).

2011 census data became available relatively late, compared to the time constraints set by the project; therefore, testing data and indicators started with 2001 data sets accessible either from Eurostat or from national sources (available data of national statistical offices of the ESPON space countries). When the 2011 dataset was to be collected, a number of further limitations regarding the availability of relevant NUTS 3 data had been uncovered. They are as follows:

1. *Relevance of indicators*

Relevance of an indicator assumes its capability to grasp, characterise or explain the nature of a certain phenomenon, in this case one of the dimensions of social exclusion. Relevance of an indicator is weak if it explains little from among the attributes of a given vulnerability to SE. For example, relevance was deemed to be weak in case of the only indicator (citizenship) of the domain of Political participation, because many of the vulnerable groups in Europe are citizens of and were born in the country where they live, whilst a considerable share of migrants belong to the upper classes. At the same time, relevance was judged strong in case of nine indicators (disposable income, unemployment rate, inactivity rate, two indicators showing educational attainment and three others indicating housing deprivation).

1. *Insufficient regional breakdown*

Some useful indicators, proposed for representing vulnerabilities to social exclusion by TiPSE, are only (or partly) available at NUTS 2 (or higher) level from Eurostat which limits the opportunities of interpretation of regional differences in a cross-European comparison. These data, for example on health care or life expectancy are mainly derived from national administrative sources, and these sources may vary by country and by variable (see <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_SDDS/EN/hlth_res_esms.htm> or <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_SDDS/EN/demoreg_esms.htm>). At the same time, national statistical sources might provide these data at lower administrative levels too.

1. *Insufficient sample size for survey based data,*

Regional data drawn from surveys often limit the level of estimation because the low sample size. Statistical estimations make possible to produce NUTS 3 level data from samples (e.g. TiPSE used NUTS 3 level LFS estimates by Swiss Statistics (CH), Istat (IT) and National Institute of Statistics (RO)). In case of a number of countries, survey-based statistical databases lack data even for NUTS 1–2 levels, and only national level data is available in several cases. Sample sizes of European statistical surveys differ country by country. For instance in case of EU Labour Force Survey sampling rates vary between 0,2 and 3,3 % (see <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/employment_unemployment_lfs/introduction>). In the case of EU-SILC there is also a varying sample limit defining the minimum effective sample size for countries (see

<http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/income_social_inclusion_living_conditions/documents/tab/Tab/EU-SILC%20sample%20size.pdf> ).

1. *Lack of harmonisation between MS,*

Harmonisation issues reflect poor definitional standardisation between countries; therefore, national boundaries show up as discontinuities. Of course it is sometimes hard to distinguish between discontinuities caused by varying classifications of neighbouring countries and genuine ones, due, for example, to different policies. A classic example is unemployment rates, which can vary due to differences in how people without jobs are treated by the welfare system, in particular how quickly, and for how long they are taken into employment related training schemes. In other cases, not only definition but classification issues can cause harmonization problems between different countries. Quality of data is influenced by conditions of publication (administrative level, classification) and countries often use varying standards for data classification and aggregation. Unfortunately international standards, like ISCO or ISCED do not always work correctly, since classifications used by some countries cannot fit properly into the provided system (e.g. ISCED in Germany or the United Kingdom).

1. *Implication of shift from tradition census to administrative registers and different methods of data gathering*

European countries use different methods of gathering census data. In 2011 many (mainly Nordic) countries used national registers to provide a collection of census data, while others like Germany, Switzerland or the Netherlands used both registers and survey extracts for this reason. Some other European countries held conventional censuses by surveying the entire population or by using a rolling sample, like in France. These different methodologies might also influence validity of cross-European comparisons since they imply different levels of representation, and it can also cause harmonization failures (classification, basis population etc. ). Moreover, some countries shifted from conventional to register-based or survey-based census between 2001 and 2011, like in the case of Switzerland, Austria and Slovenia which might also affects analyses of changes over time in these countries.

1. *Changes in the NUTS system*

There were several amendments of NUTS boundaries in the past fifteen years. The regulation on NUTS system specifies stability of the classification for at least three years. It is very important considering comparability of data from different survey years since this stability makes sure that data refers to the same regional unit for a certain period of time (see <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/nuts_nomenclature/history_nuts>). TiPSE data on vulnerabilities to social exclusion refer to NUTS 2010 in the case of census 2011 data, while census data for 2001 (1999–2005) were published according to NUTS 2003 and 2006 versions. Limitations of direct comparison in several cases stem from such changes; affecting Germany, Denmark, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Finland, Sweden and the United Kingdom. Perspectives of further comparisons are probably also hindered by the latest reshaping of NUTS system in 2013, affecting Germany, Greece, France, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia and the United Kingdom.

The social exclusion data base (Annexes 3, 6 and 8) comprises calculated indicators which are not available elsewhere. (For detailed description of approaches, theoretical and methodological considerations, steps of data collection and indicator setting see Annex 6). Data collection targeted the so-called ESPON space (32 countries of Europe); therefore, geographical coverage is as wide as data availability allowed. 2001 data dominate the dataset because they were the only ones available for setting and testing indicators until 2011 data began to appear in March-June of 2014. The 2001 collection contains 60 variables (raw data – 12 Eurostat EU LFS, 4 Eurostat, 44 census) and 50 indicators (10 Eurostat EU LFS, 4 Eurostat, 36 census).

### Assessment of the database as a basis for monitoring

Despite reductions in the number of indicators for 2011, imbalances continued to exist, though to a lesser extent: Three domains – ‘Earning a living, Access to services, Social environment – are now covered by six, eight and seven indicators respectively, whilst a single indicator, citizenship, is provided under the domain of Political participation. The 2011 round includes 4 Eurostat and 29 census variables out of which 4 Eurostat indicators and 18 census indicators were developed. Thus during the course of testing (mapping), the original set of 50 (2001) indicators was reduced to 22.

As far as NUTS levels are concerned, the indicators calculated from census data are available on NUTS 3 level (18 indicators), whilst those calculated from Eurostat data are provided on NUTS 2 level (4 indicators).

The two sets of indicators (2001 and 2011) might be expected to be comparable. However in a number of cases, gaps in geographical coverage, changes in data collection methods in certain member states ( e.g. shift from conventional to register-based census) and that of NUTS system, undermine this comparability.

The 22 indicators of the 2001 and 2011 series offered by TiPSE as core territorial indicators available for longitudinal monitoring were further screened according to their suitability for mapping. The method was developed during the course of macro-regional analysis of 2001 maps, Atlantic and Central European Region (Annex 8) using four criteria: harmonisation already explained above and another three, coverage, discrimination and interpretation. A simple traffic light assessment was employed.

1. *Coverage* is simply defined as the proportion of regions/countries for which there is no data. Green means there are few, if any, gaps, and the spatial pattern is not masked by missing data, red means that there are many regions coloured white, and for this reason it is not easy to discern any pattern.
2. *Discrimination* is assessed in terms of the degree to which the maps show variation between regions and within countries which provides a meaningful picture of an aspect of social exclusion.
3. The *Interpretation* criterion assesses the extent to which the map can inform us about patterns of social exclusion. Here a red colour coding might reflect ambiguities in the indicator, or a chaotic pattern on the map which is not easy to explain. To some extent it will be conditioned by the preceding three criteria.

These three criteria together with three others; harmonisation issues, the availability of NUTS 3 level data, and relevance to poverty and social exclusion, represented the aspects of screening along which qualification via scoring was performed. Scores were summarized and evaluated by traffic lights. Appendix 6 shows the outcome, reflecting that in spite of the progress between 2001 and 2011 which was a result of improvements in coverage, only 18 indicators reached at least amber: four qualified for green (recommended), 13 indicators were judged amber (recommended with limitations) and the rest, five were “disqualified” by red scores (not recommended).

The fact, however, that the core collection of NUTS-3 level territorial indicators of TiPSE comprises exclusively census data, sets major limitations, in relation to the process of monitoring, not only because of the weak or sometimes ambiguous relevance of a number of indicators (illustrated by Appendix 6), but also with regard to the a ten year update cycle.

Figure : Available P&SE indicators at NUT 2-3 levels

Figure 1 summarises the availability of NUTS 2 level Eurostat poverty and social exclusion indicators available for year by year monitoring and the NUTS 3 level TiPSE (Census-based) collection available for longitudinal comparison between data of 2001 and 2011.

# Recommendations for Social Exclusion Monitoring derived from the Review of Policy

This section derives recommendations from the Annex 10 review of policy implications in the light of the monitoring arrangements described in section 2 above, and data availability, as reflected in Section 4. We suggest realistic amendments concerning the shortcomings of the present monitoring and evaluation processes of policies related to territorial aspects of social exclusion. Before we start pointing to some weaknesses of the monitoring systems, we should acknowledge that existing mechanisms of both the Social OMC and Cohesion policy are extremely well developed and sensitive to focus on their own, especially in case of the former. What needs further elaboration and probably financial support could be summarized under four headlines:

1. broadening the set of data expressing aspects of multidimensional phenomenon of social exclusion
2. increasing the number of existing and new data accessible as low territorial (NUTS) level as possible
3. responding to the already mutually expressed interest of the bodies in charge of monitoring towards one another’s core issues, include actors and exchange of experiences (mutual learning)
4. making the already existing data (indicators) accessible in a more user-friendly manner.

1. The overall endeavour of TiPSE addressed the weaknesses in coverage of a social phenomenon of multidimensional nature, that is social exclusion with accessible and reliable indicators. Section 4 of this paper and Task 6 in Annex 6 illustrates in detail the limitations the researchers had to face. A number of compromises had to made by the team to overcome imbalances in coverage of the domains and dimensions of social exclusion with indicators. This is caused by lacking data sometimes even at NUTS0 level: in case of the domain of ‘Political participation’ one single poorly relevant mapable indicator (citizenship) was found and analysed. Therefore there is a need to adapt data availability to the concept of social exclusion which is complex, multifaceted, multidimensional as Talbot et al. conceptualised in Annex 1.

Adaptation in this case has address two weaknesses,

* a thematic broadening of data collection both from key Eurostat surveys (SILC, LFS) and registers via national statistical institutions (NSI) mainly in fields of political participation, access to services and social environment;
* widening the size of survey samples in order to be able to make at least NUTS 2 level estimations.

2. It is a recommendation out of compromise since Annex 10 pointed out that proper territorial analysis of social exclusion would need regularly issued NUTS 3 level data (p22 Annex 10). The job has to be implemented not only in co-operation with MSs but also a suitable division of labour should be developed. Vulnerable social groups and hidden vulnerable spaces could be explored within the reporting processes feeding into the European Semester. Reporting, however generates quite a burden on specific sections of national administrative systems, therefore their scope should be kept under control. Nevertheless, reporting should be revised and rationalised in a way that regional chapters could be included at least to the National Reform Programs as suggested also by Task 10. (p35 of Annex 10.)

3. A number of announcements and existing practices underpin that the gates are open for a more intensive co-operation between DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion, on the one hand, and DG Regional and Urban Policy on the other hand. From among relevant announcements we quote here a 2008 Communication from the Commission on “*A renewed commitment to social Europe: “Regional and local authorities should be better involved in the EU process for social protection and social inclusion*” (Commission of the European Communities 2008, p8). Another supporting evidence is provided by a background paper to the SPC from an Ad-hoc Group on ‘Reinvigorating the Social OMC in context of the Europe 2020 Strategy’ suggests in a 2011 report that “*some policy dimensions (including the need to monitor the social dimension of the Europe 2020 strategy by the SPC and within the framework of the Social OMC) are not satisfactorily covered in the existing set of indicators*” therefore indicators should be enhanced with regard

* monitoring indicators between social, economic, employment and environmental policies
* the commonly decided thematic priorities
* reporting on vulnerable groups

Bringing territorial issues and aspects of social exclusion of vulnerable groups such as migrants, ethnic minorities and overlapping – territorial and social – disadvantages into the reporting procedure of SPC would be an appropriate response to suggestions of the Ad-hoc Group. (Social Protection Community 2011)

Given that cohesion policies cover social cohesion, social Issues seem well embedded into the monitoring procedure: the set of Commonly Agreed Indicators still cover indicators relevant from the point of view of social policies, the series of ‘Cohesion Policy Strategy Reports 2013’ do include volumes exploring topics relevant from the point of view of social exclusion such as social inclusion, labour market, human resources. (See the volumes retrieved in September 15 2014. <http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/how/policy/doc/strategic_report/2013/factsheet11_social_inclusion_infra.pdf>

<http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/how/policy/doc/strategic_report/2013/factsheet10_labour_market.pdf>

<http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/how/policy/doc/strategic_report/2013/factsheet12_human_capital.pdf>)

However, specific vulnerable groups and overlapping territorial and social vulnerabilities are not properly considered. These are the fields that should be discussed in co-operation of experts (network of independent experts of social protection and that of regional development) and bodies responsible for social protection (like SPC, European Platform against Poverty and Social Exclusion), regional and rural development policies (Regional Development Committee, Committee of the regions, DG Agriculture and DG Regio). The ultimate goal is, if course, not only to explore vulnerable groups and places, more broadly, the territorial, social and economic interplays as determinants of social exclusion but also to develop tailored policy interventions. As Task 2.10 (Annex 10) pointed out, important steps have been taken by the European Union by setting EU2020 targets and thematic priorities to European Social and Investment Funds (ESIF) with no 6 ‘promoting social inclusion, combating poverty and any discrimination’ amongst them, the minimum 20% spending of European Social Fund on social inclusion and also methodological issues, such as the extension of participatory approaches to development like CLLD. (Annex 10 p6) However, what is suggested by the Commission is not always used by member states: it is well illustrated by the scarce application of CLLD amongst the most vulnerable MSs. (Hungary for example decided to stay with LEADER and not opt for CLLD and spends as little as 5% of the allocated budget of EAFRD for it. Another detail from the accepted Partnership Agreement: the share of thematic priority no 6 in EAFRDF budget targeting specifically rural poverty and social exclusion is 1,3%). (Európai Bizottság 2014)

Finally, providing better, more user friendly access to available data probably needs least efforts comparing to the former three, it is still important. Census data collection in the TiPSE project for both 2001 and 2011 was performed by using national census databases. However, a regional census database for 2001 from Eurostat is accessible, it is quite incomplete. The new Eurostat Census Hub with 2011 data was launched in mid-2014 and it is accessible on an experimental basis with an incomplete set of data. These databases are very useful for a cross-European comparison at lower regional levels, but they should be completed in order to reduce the costs and workload required perform data collection from national sources.

Another easily achievable step towards user friendliness would be if annual reports of Employment and Social Protection Committees published data and charts in excel format, too, taking the example from the cohesion reports.

Appendix 7 to this report presents the recommendations already proposed in Annex 10, but elaborates them in terms of their monitoring implications and practices.

# Key action points

The preceding pages cover a lot of ground, across a wide and complex landscape of administrative structures, policy activities, and data collection. Any attempt to summarise it is doomed to fail by omitting many vital details. However the following broad principles may help by drawing out common threads from the detailed discussion above.

The three kinds of activity which are recommended are as follows:

1. Broadening the scope of social exclusion monitoring to include more indicators relating to less tangible aspects of P&SE domains 2-4.
2. Increasing the level of regional detail – ideally to NUTS 3, but where this is not feasible in terms of cost or practicalities of sampling, to NUTS 2.
3. To make full use of the regional monitoring data in the context of reporting procedures relating to EU 2020, the EU Social OMC, and Cohesion policy

The first two activities above are inter-related, in the sense that the current focus upon the first domain privileges the geographical distribution of income and employment aspects of social exclusion in policy targeting. It is important that the geographical specificities of the other three domains are more adequately reflected in the design and implementation of future interventions.

In terms of how such data needs may be satisfied in practice there appears to be a natural distinction between the relatively “hard” and quantified indicators of income poverty, and the more qualitative aspects of social exclusion:

1. In the case of the former we believe that there would be merit to exploring the potential for rolling out register-based regional databases for key indicators of income poverty (on the Nordic model). These would ideally be made accessible to researchers, and the general public, through the medium of a Eurostat “hub”, similar to that already being piloted for Census data.
2. The register model is probably not appropriate for collecting indicators of the more qualitative aspects of social exclusion (particularly domains 2-4). These probably require a survey approach. The EU SILC survey currently has a predominantly financial architecture, but consideration should be given to broadening/deepening its coverage of “living conditions” aspects. Furthermore, it would be extremely helpful if, on the financial side, more information on the cost of a range of essentials could form the basis of an indicator of living costs. At the same time it will be important to deliver the regional sampling enhancement mentioned above under activity (ii).

Clearly this is a substantial list of recommendations, the cost of which will not be insignificant. However the rewards in terms of more cost effective policy targeting would also be substantial, and at least some of the required changes (such as a shift to register based income poverty monitoring) would be following existing trends, and making better use of existing data and information handling capacity.

# References

Commission of the European Communities 2003, *Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee, and the Committee of the Regions Strengthening the social dimension of the Lisbon strategy: Streamlining open method of coordination in the field of social protection*. Com(2003) 261 final, Brussels, 27.05.2003

Commission of the European Communities 2005, *Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee, and the Committee of the Regions. Working together, working better: A new framework for the open coordination of social protection and inclusion policies in the European Union*, Com(2005) 706 final, Brussels, 22.12.2005

Commission of the European Communities 2003, *Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee, and the Committee of the Regions "A renewed commitment to social Europe: Reinforcing the Open Method of Coordination for Social Protection and Social Inclusion".* Com(2008) 418 final, Brussels, 2.7.2008

Commission of the European Communities, Eurostat 2003, *Laeken Indicators – Detailed Calculation Methodolog*y. Working Group ‘Statistics on Income, Poverty and Social Exclusion’, 28-29 April 2003. Doc.E2/IPSE/2003

http://www.cso.ie/en/media/csoie/eusilc/documents/Laeken,Indicators,-,calculation,algorithm.pdf

Commission of the European Communities 2013, *Report from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee, and the Committee of the Regions.* Cohesion policy: Strategic report 2013 on programme implementation 2007-2013. Com(2013) 2010 final, Brussels, 18.04.2013 <http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/how/policy/doc/strategic_report/2013/swd_strat_report_2013_en.pdf>

Copus, A. K. & Coombes, M. 2014. Small Area Estimation of At Risk of Poverty Rates. *Second ESPON 2013 Scientific Report*. Luxemburg: ESPON 2013 Coordination Unit.

Czirfusz M. in collaboration with Kovács K. and Tagai G. (2014): Development and mapping social exclusion indicators. Annex 6 of the TiPSE Final Report

Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion and Social Protection Committee (2012), *The pension adequacy in the European Union 2010-2050*.

Európai Bizottság (2014), *Összefoglalás Magyarországnak a 2014–2020-as időszakra vonatkozó partnerségi megállapodásáról*. Brüsszel, 2014. Augusztus 26.

http://ec.europa.eu/contracts\_grants/pa/partnership-agreement-hungary-summary\_hu.pdf

European Commission DG Regional Policy and Cohesion (2006), *The new programming period 2000-2006. Methodological Working Papers. Indicators for Monitoring and Evaluation: an indicative methodology*

European Commission DG Regional Policy, DG Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities (2012), *Guidance note on indicative contents and structure for the national strategic reports 2012*

European Commission (2014), *The programing period 2014-2020. Monitoring and evaluation of European cohesion policy. European Regional Development Fund, European Social Fund, European Cohesion Fund*. <http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/2014/working/wd_2014_en.pdf> Retrieved in September 23, 2014.

European Council (2012), European Council, 9 December 2011. *Conclusions*. Co Eur 24, Concl 6. Brussels, January 25, 2012

European Union (2014a), *Investment for jobs and growth. Promoting development and good governance in EU regions and cities*. Sixth report on economic, social and territorial cohesion. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 201

European Union (2014b), *Social Europe. Many ways, one objective*. Annual Report of the Social Protection Committee on the social situation in the European Union (2013). Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2014

Lisbon European Council 23 and 24 March 2000, *Presidency Conclusions*. <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/lis1_en.htm>. Retrieved in September 23, 2014.

Ministry of Labour and Social Policy and UNDP (2006) *Social exclusion and integration in Poland. An indicators-based approach.* Warsaw.

Social Protection Committee (2011), *Draft background paper to the SPC from the Ad-hoc group on ‘Reinvigorating the Social OMC in the context of the Europe 2020 strategy.* Reference: SPC /2011.09/1

Social Protection Committee (2012a) *SPC advisory report to the European Commission on tackling and preventing child poverty, promoting child well-being*.

Social Protection Committee (2012b) *Preparation of the 2012 National Social Reports (NSR)* Brussels, 15.02.2012 Reference : SPC/2012.2/4.

Social Protection Committee (2012c) *Social protection performance monitor (SPPM) – methodological report by the Indicators Sub-group of the Social Protection Committee*

Tagai G., in collaboration with Kovács K. and Czirfusz M. et al. (2014a), *Analysis of Conceptual Implications of Social Exclusion Maps.* Annex 6 of the TiPSE Draft Final Report

Tagai G., in collaboration with Kovács K. and Czirfusz M. et al. (2014b), *Analysis of Conceptual Implications of Social Exclusion Maps*. Annex 6 of the TiPSE Final Report

Talbot H., Madanipour A., Shucksmith M. (2014a) *Review of Concepts of Poverty and Social Exclusion*. Annex 1 of the TiPSE Final Report

Talbot H., Madanipour A., Shucksmith M. (2014b) *Implications for Policy*. Annex 10 of the TiPSE Final Report

UNDP (2011) *Beyond Transition. Towards Inclusive Societies.* Regional Bureau for Europe and CIS.

# Appendix 1: Monitoring tasks in the 2014-2020 Programming Period

**Division of tasks in EU monitoring and evaluation procedure for the 2014-2020 programming period[[12]](#footnote-12)**

**Member State/Managing Authority**

In the AIR: Synthesis of the findings of all evaluations of the programme By 31 May each year from 2016 until 2023, by 30 June in 2017 and 2019 CPR Art. 50

**Member State**

*In the progress reports*: Progress made towards achievement of the Union strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth, as well as of the Fund-specific missions (including YEI where appropriate) By 31 August 2017 and by 31 August 2019 CPR Art. 52

*Member State Report* summarising the findings of evaluations carried out during the programming period By 31 December 2022 CPR Art. 114

**Commission**

Summary report based on the annual implementation reports of the Member States; as well as a synthesis of the findings of the available evaluations of programmes Each year from 2016 CPR Art. 53

Commission Strategic report summarising the progress reports of the Member States By 31 December 2017 and 31December 2019 CPR Art.53

# Appendix 2: List of Laeken indicators 2001

1. At-risk-of-poverty rate
2. At-risk-of-poverty threshold
3. S80/S20 income quintile share ratio
4. Persistent at-risk-of-poverty rate
5. Persistent at-risk-of-poverty rate (alternative threshold)
6. Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap
7. Regional cohesion
8. Long-term unemployment rate
9. Persons living in jobless households
10. Early school leavers not in education or training
11. Life expectancy at birth
12. Self defined health status
13. Dispersion around the at-risk-of-poverty threshold
14. At-risk-of-poverty rate anchored at one moment in time
15. At-risk-of-poverty rate before cash social transfers
16. [Gini coefficient](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gini_coefficient)
17. In-work at risk of poverty rate
18. Long term unemployment share
19. Very long term unemployment rate

# Appendix 3: Overarching indicators for monitoring social OMC 2008

1a. At risk of poverty rate (total, children, elderly)

1b. Relative median poverty risk gap

1c. Persistent at risk of poverty rate (available from 2010)

2. Inequality of income distribution (S80/S20)

3. Healthy life expectancy

4. Early school leavers

5. People living in jobless households

6. Projected Total Public Expenditures

7a Median relative income of the elderly people

7b. Aggregate replacement ratio

8 Self-reported unmet need for medical care

9. At risk of poverty rate anchored at a fixed moment in time

10. Employment rate of older workers

11. In-work poverty risk

12. Activity rate

13. Regional disparities (coefficient of variation of employment rates)

14. Total health expenditure per capita

# Appendix 4: SPC Dashboard Indicators and Contextual Information

1. **List of dashboard indicators (Compiled from Social Protection Committee 2012c p5-6)**

* At risk of poverty or social exclusion rate (total population) (Eurostat – EU SILC)
* At-risk-of-poverty rate (AROP) Eurostat – EU SILC
* Severe material deprivation rate (Europe 2020 Eurostat – EU SILC)
* Share of population(0-59) in very
* Low work intensity households (VLWI) Eurostat – EU SILC
* Relative poverty risk gap rate (total population) Eurostat – EU SILC
* Income quintile ratio S80/S20 Eurostat – EU SILC
* At risk of poverty or social exclusion rate (0-17) Eurostat – EU SILC
* Impact of social transfers on poverty (excluding pensions) Eurostat – EU SILC
* At-risk-of-poverty rate for the population living in very low work intensity households (0-59) Eurostat – EU SILC
* In-work at-risk-of-poverty rate (18-64) Social consequences Eurostat – EU SILC
* Long-term unemployment rate (active population, 15+) Eurostat – LFS
* Youth unemployment ratio (15-24) Eurostat - LFS
* Early leavers from education and training (18-24) Eurostat – LFS
* Employment rate of older workers (55-64) Eurostat – LFS
* At risk of poverty or social exclusion rate (65+) Eurostat – EU SILC
* Median relative income ratio of elderly people Eurostat – EU SILC
* Aggregate replacement ratio Eurostat – EU SILC
* Housing cost overburden rate Eurostat – EU SILC
* Share of the population with selfreported unmet need for medical care (total population) Eurostat – EU SILC
* Healthy life years at 65 ( total population, breakdown by gender) Eurostat

1. **List of contextual information (Compiled from Social Protection Committee 2012c p7-8)**

* Share of the population confronted with "only" one of the 3
* problems (AROP, SMD or VLWI)
* EU-SILC the Europe 2020 target
* Share of the population confronted with 2 or 3 of the 3
* problems (AROP, SMD, VLWI)
* Eurostat – EU-SILC
* GDP growth/ GDP per capita (in PPS) Eurostat
* Public debt (current and projected)
* Activity rate Eurostat - LFS
* Employment rate (by ISCED level) Eurostat-LFS
* Unemployment rate Eurostat-LFS
* Projected total public (social) expenditure (in % of GDP) National Accounts
* Social protection expenditure (by types of risk) Eurostat - Esspros Funding of social
* protection
* Current and projected change in age-related expenditure
* Old age dependency ratio Eurostat
* Change in projected theoretical replacement ratio for base
* case 2010-2060 EC/SPC Pension
* Healthy life years at birth( total population, breakdown by gender) Eurostat
* Life expectancy at birth ( total population, breakdown by gender) Eurostat
* Life expectancy at 65 ( total population, breakdown by gender) Eurostat
* Infant mortality Eurostat
* Tertiary educational attainment Eurostat
* Adult lifelong learning participation Eurostat – LFS
* At risk of poverty or social exclusion of migrants ( non-EU
* nationals) Eurostat – EU SILC

**Structure of the SPPM (Social Protection Committee 2012c p2)**



# Appendix 5: Commonly agreed P&SE indicators (European Commission 2006)

* Status on the labour market (employees, independent)
* Unemployed (short or long term), inactive (of which at school))
* Reduction in the youth unemployment rate % (Men/Women)
* Exclusion Reduction in the rate of LTU % (Men/Women)
* Employability and LLL
* Increase in the participation rate of the labour force to training
* Reduction in school drop-out rates % (Men/Women)
* Entrepreneurship, % (Men/Women)
* Increase in the number of SMEs using continuous training % (Men/Women)
* Number of new businesses % and number
* Increase in female activity rate %

Appendix 6: ESPON TiPSE indicators of social exclusion by dimensions and domains

| *Domain identified by Task 2.1 and Task 2.6.* | *Dimension identified by Task 2.1 and Task 2.6* | *Indicator further specified by Task 2.6* | | *Source* | *Coverage of TiPSE collection (by Years)* | | | *Further qualification \**  *summarised by traffic lights* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Earning a living | Income earned by tax payers | Net disposable household income | | Eurostat (NUTS2) | 2001, 2011 | | | ++++(-)(+) |
| Ratio of employed persons in elementary occupations | | Census | 2001, 2011 | | | ++--(+)(+/-) |
| Employment | Activity gender gap | | Census | 2001, 2011 | | | +-+-(+)(+/-) |
| Unemployment rate | | Census | 2001, 2011 | | | +-+-(+)(+) |
| Youth (15–24) unemployment rate | | Census | 2001, 2011 | | | +-+-(+)(+/-) |
| Inactivity rate | | Census | 2001, 2011 | | | +-++(+)(+) |
| Access to basic services | Health | Health personnel per 100,000 inhabitants | | Eurostat (NUTS1–2) | 2001, 2011 | | | -+--(-)(+/-) |
| Hospital beds per 100,000 inhabitants | | Eurostat (NUTS1–2) | 2001, 2011 | | | -+--(-)(+/-) |
| Healthy life expectancy at birth | | Eurostat (NUTS1–2) | 2001, 2011 | | | ++++(-)(+) |
| Education | Ratio of population with low qualification | | Census | 2001, 2011 | | | +-++(+)(+) |
| Ratio of population with high qualification | | Census | 2001, 2011 | | | +-++(+)(+) |
| *Domain identified by WP2.1 and 2.6.* | *Dimension identified by WP2.1 and 2.6* | | *Indicator further specified by WP2.6* | *Source* | | *Coverage of TiPSE collection (by Years)* | *Further qualification \**  *summarised by traffic lights* | |
| Access to basic services | Housing | | Ratio of housing units without water supply system | Census | | 2001, 2011 | --+- (+)(+) | |
| Ratio of housing units without bath or shower | Census | | 2001, 2011 | --+- (+)(+) | |
| Number of occupants per room | Census | | 2001, 2011 | --+-(+)(+) | |
| Social environment | Age | | Total dependency rate | Census | | 2001, 2011 | +++-(+)(+/-) | |
| Child dependency rate | Census | | 2001, 2011 | +++-(+)(+/-) | |
| Old age dependency rate | Census | | 2001, 2011 | +++-(+)(+/-) | |
| Ethnic composition | | Ratio of Roma population | Census | | 2001, 2011 | -++-(+)(+) | |
| Immigrants | | Ratio of foreign-born population | Census | | 2001, 2011 | +++-(+)(+/-) | |
| Household structure (new dimension of WP2.6) | | Ratio of lone parent households | Census | | 2001, 2011 | +-+-(+)(+/-) | |
| Ratio of households with 6 or more persons | Census | | 2001, 2011 | +++-(+)(+/-) | |
| Political participation | Citizenship | | Ratio of population not citizens of the country | Census | | 2001, 2011 | +++-(+)(+/-) | |

*Order of signals: Coverage, Harmonization, Discrimination, Interpretation (NUTS level)(relevance)*

*Meaning of signals: +=basically positive, -=basically negative, NUTS+, lover NUTS=-, (in case of SE relevance: +/- the relevance is not straightforward)*

*Scoring: two + criteria were conditional to amber, (+) NUTS 3 availability of data and (+) relevance to P&SE were conditional to green*

# Appendix 7: Recommendations derived from Annex 10, and their monitoring implications

| **Selection of relevant policy recommendations by Task 10** | **Actions to be taken** | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **EU level** | **MS level** |
| 2.7.1. Use a broad conceptualisation of P&SE | A.) Establish a joint working group from members of working staff of DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion, DG Regional Policy, and DG Agriculture & Rural Development. Mobilise and include members of the related independent networks of experts  B.) Broaden the thematic scope of survey data in order to cover more aspects of P&SE particularly in case of EU SILC. Potential themes explored in more detail: political participation, discrimination, health, education.  C.) Explore and collect new register data in order to cover dimensions of P&SE more completely  1. Assign responsible institutions, experts  2. Initiate and coordinate the process (initiating themes, methods of data collection, etc.)  3. Set up partner networks (NSO-s) | A.) Send delegates  Co-operate if necessary  Co-finance if needed  Co-operate if necessary  Co-finance if needed  1. Assign partner institution(s) (NSTs) and/or experts.  2. Active participation in the process of accepting additional commonly agreed dimension of P&SE , indicators covering them and data to be collected to create them  3. Explore new channels of collecting data (central and local state administrations, institutions ) |
| 2.7.2. Social protection Committee (SPC), Eurostat: P&SE data should be collected and analysed regularly at least at the NUTS 2 level | 1. Organise a forum for needs assessment with regard updating thematic scopes and revising sample size of EU SILC.  2. Increase EU SILC sample size in countries where it is too low to allow NUTS 2 level estimations. | 1. Active participation  2. Co-finance if necessary |
| SPC: Asses the value of using complementary methods | 1. Use opportunities of PROGRESS to generate and support applied research projects that develop appropriate methodologies  2. Share experiences via peer reviewing | Initiate project proposals  Co-finance projects  Adapt approaches  2. Participate in peer reviewing |
| SPC: Consider producing a ‘themed report’ | 1. Like in case of child poverty and pension adequacy[[13]](#footnote-13) develop a report on territorial aspects of P&SE by the working staff of SPC in cooperation with DG Regio  2. DG Regio working staff people could also generate a report on vulnerable people (migrants, ethnic minorities like Roma, very longterm unemployed[[14]](#footnote-14)) in vulnerable spaces (remote rural areas, segregated neighbourhoods in urban and rural areas) in cooperation with SPC working staff. | 1. Use and adapt policy implications |
| Committee of Economic and Social Affairs: National Reform Programmes should include Regional Chapters | Develop guidelines, recommend indicators as means of analysis | 1. Use LAU 2 level data to construct indicators from reliable statistical or administrative sources and aggregate for higher level territorial analysis  2. When including regional chapters connect EU and national reporting that will probably harmonise the European and national policies more. |
| DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion, DG Regio: Elaborate the geography of P&SE incidence at both NUTS2/3 and at high level grouping scale | Use the set of TiPSE core indicators for indicating and analysing P&SE incidence at NUTS 3 level | |

1. **National Reform Programme -** a document which presents the policies and measures to sustain growth and jobs in MSs and to reach the Europe 2020 targets.  [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Employment and Social Policy Committee [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The Euro Plus Pact was adopted on 25th March 2011 by the European Council. The Pact stipulates a range of targets meant to strengthen competitiveness and convergence of MSs. Eurozone countries are fully covered, six non Euro-zone countries also joined the Pact (BG, DK, LV, LT, Pl, RO), whilst four member states did not enter (CZ, HU, SE, UK). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The three strands of OMC are: (i.) social protection, (ii.) pension, (iii.) health care and longterm case, [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Definition of ‘ARoP’: Share of persons aged 0+ with an equalised disposable income below 60% of the national equalised median income. Equalised median income is defined as the household's total disposable income divided by its "equivalent size", to take account of the size and composition of the household, and is attributed to each household member. Equalization is made on the basis of the OECD modified scale. Source Eurostat, EU SILC (European Union 2014b p479) [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Definition of ‘Share of population in very low work intensity (VLWI) households’: People aged 0-59, living in households, where working-age adults (18-59) work less than 20% of their total work potential during the past year. Source Eurostat, EU SILC (European Union 2014b p479) [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Definition of ‘Serious Material Deprivation Rate’: Share of population living in households lacking at least 4 items out of the following 9 items: i) to pay rent or utility bills, ii) keep home adequately warm, iii) face unexpected expenses, iv) eat meat, fish or a protein equivalent every second day, v) a week holiday away from home, or could not afford (even if wanted to) vi) a car, vii) a washing machine, viii) a colour TV, or ix) a telephone. Source Eurostat, EU SILC (European Union 2014b p479) [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Definition of ‘At risk of poverty or social exclusion rate’: The sum of persons who are: at-risk-of-poverty or severely materially deprived or living in households with very low work intensity as a share of the total population, source Eurostat, EU SILC (European Union 2014 b p479) [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. <http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/index_en.htm> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. <http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/about/> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
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