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Why EU-SILC? – The Context (1)

Provides objective and impartial performance indicators/signals on income, poverty, inequality and social exclusion for Ireland.

- Enables the construction of Government policy to optimise economic and societal outcomes.
- Allows Government to measure the impact of implemented policies.
- Allows Advocacy Groups, Researchers, the Media and Citizens to engage in evidence based discussions, research and policy formulation.
The data is positive skewed.
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Why EU-SILC? – The Context (2)

• SILC is being increasingly used at EU and international level to inform policy and to draw international/regional comparisons.
• DG Regio are advising that as part of the development of the EU’s Cohesion Policy and in the next round of EU funding they would like EU-SILC indicators to be used to inform their decisions (€352 Billion – 2014-2020)
  – European Regional Development Fund, European Social Fund, etc.
  – DG Empl would like SILC indicators to be elevated to the status of macro-economic indicators
  – Possible inclusion in the Macroeconomic Imbalance Procedure (MIP)
  – *The major constraints are the robustness and the timeliness of the data across the EU.*
Incomplete picture at regional level
NUTS 2
## SILC Content – Proposed Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nucleus (EU2020, main indicators)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Every 3-year modules Max. 20 var. each</th>
<th>Every 6-year modules Max. 20 var. each</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income (revised) Material Deprivation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td><strong>Quality of life</strong>, social &amp; cultural participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic activity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>New policy needs 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demography</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Labour &amp; housing conditions</td>
<td><strong>Over-indebtedness, wealth, consumption</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>New policy needs 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Access to services (social transfers in kind)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing costs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Labour &amp; housing conditions</td>
<td>Intergenerational &amp; <strong>Homelessness</strong>/New policy 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life 1st wave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2017 SILC $ahm = \text{Regulation (} + \text{ESSA)}$

- **Draft REG**
  - Children health (4/6 var.)
    - Health (11 var.)

- **ESSA**
  - Health (10 var.)
    - Labour (5 + 2 var.)
      - Over-indebtedness (8 var.)
      - Consumption & wealth (10 var.)

1. Homelessness
2. QoL
3. Intergenerational Transmission of disadvantages
Data Sources

- EU-SILC Household Survey
- Social Welfare Data
- Revenue Data
- Other Admin. Sources
Multi-Stage Cluster Sampling

- Household Samples
- Reduce Cost (€) in sample allocation
  - More important for ‘Face to Face’ interviewing
- Field-force operational constraints
- Increase Cost in terms of Precision
  - Less precise than a SRS, usually expressed in terms of a Design Effect
  - Efficient cluster sampling requires many clusters and fewer households in each cluster
  - Sample size alone is not a sufficient indicator of quality
EU-SILC is currently a 4-Year Rotational Panel Sample (6-Year Proposal)
2014 Response Rates

- Overall 54%
  - Wave 1 48%
  - Waves 2-4 84%
CSO Household Surveys - Achieved Sample Size in 2013

- QNHS (Avg. Per QTR): 19,500
- HFCS: 5,545
- EU-SILC: 4,922
- HBS 2010: 5,891

[x 4]
Longitudinal/Panel Sample

Achieved HH sample size, 2012 L data
Coherence and Consistency Tests between EU-SILC and Other Data Sources
Similar EU 2013 HFCS/EU-SILC comparisons ranged from

- 81% Slovenia
- 112% Belgium

Median about 100%

- Separate study by the Irish Central Bank showed similar comparisons for gross & net income and the Gini coefficient
Precision Estimates
95% Confidence Intervals
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IGEES Network Launch – Conference on Distributional Aspects of Public Policy 2015
Timeliness - Is Ireland Really Poor?

• Issues to be considered
  – Duration & timing of fieldwork
  – Overlap between the reference year and the income data provided to Eurostat
    • Many countries are sending (T-1) income data
  – If we publish nationally in October we will publish at T + 8 months (the UK is currently at T+ 15 months)
  – Future Requirements
    • Early Indicators @ T + 2 Months
    • Income etc. @ T + 6 Months
**Timeliness - Solutions**

- Flash Estimates – Deprivation indicators
- Now-casting
- Change duration & timing fieldwork (?)
- Send T-1 income data (relevance?)
Thank you!
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## EU-SILC Modules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Module</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Access to Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Module on Social and Cultural Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Material Deprivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Wellbeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Housing conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Intergenerational transmission of disadvantages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Intra-household sharing of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Material deprivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Over-indebtedness and financial exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Housing conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Social participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Intergenerational transmission of poverty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>