

**UNITED NATIONS  
ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE  
CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN STATISTICIANS**

Seminar on poverty measurement  
5-6 May 2015, Geneva, Switzerland  
**Agenda item: Monetary poverty**

## **Planned future developments of EU SILC**

Prepared by the Eurostat<sup>1</sup>

### **1. Introduction**

The current crisis has generated a number of challenges for official statistics and more in particular for social statistics. Policy makers have turned to statistics to have the necessary toolbox to timely and reliably describe the current situation and patterns in order to take informed, timely and effective policy measures. In this context, there is increasing demand from the stakeholders for new developments in EU-SILC to insure the correct monitoring of the evolution of social exclusion phenomena as main data source for comparative analysis and indicators on income and living conditions in the EU.

In the meanwhile, resources available to statistical authorities are under pressure in several Member States and only coordinated efforts for achieving modern and cost effective solutions are a viable way forward. Modernisation of social statistics is indeed a key solution identified to meet the growing needs of users through improved statistical processes, reuse of data and synergies achieved through integration and standardisation. The revision of EU-SILC is part of this process carried out by the European Statistical System (ESS).

EU-SILC is however a complex survey involving different challenging methodological problems. The contribution from researchers is therefore a vital element for making EU-SILC a scientifically sound, effective and high quality instrument. Hence, results of the methodological work on EU-SILC undertaken in the framework of the "Second Network for the Analysis of EU-SILC" (Net-SILC2) are being implemented in the production process of EU-SILC data

### **2. Policy context**

Since the launch of the "Europe 2020" Strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth, the importance of EU-SILC has grown further: one of the five Europe 2020 headline targets is based on EU-SILC data (the social inclusion EU target, which consists of lifting at least 20 million people in the EU from the risk of poverty and exclusion by 2020). The indicator used for measuring progress towards this target is the At-risk-of poverty and social exclusion – AROPE. It measures the number of people either at-risk of monetary poverty (household income below 60% of the national median income) or severely materially deprived (at least 4 among 9 deprivation items) or in very low work intensity (household using less than 20% of its potential work capacity). In the context of the mid-term review of the EU 2020 strategy, the basket of material deprivation variables in EU-SILC is under revision.

---

<sup>1</sup> Emilio Di Meglio, Didier Dupré.

The social consequences of the economic and financial crisis have given increased importance to data on the income and social situation. In particular, the lack of timely data on the extent of poverty and social exclusion has become a burning issue especially for countries where the crisis has hit hardest. In December 2010, ministers of social affairs recognised the importance of this issue and invited “the European Commission to support, in collaboration with the Member States, the timely availability of valid indicators to monitor the social dimension of the Europe 2020 Strategy”.

The “Social Investment Package” adopted in February 2013, urging countries to put more emphasis on social investment to achieve the EU2020 target, also increased the demand of timely and reliable data on the social situation in Europe.

Moreover, the ‘Beyond GDP’ debate has drawn attention to the need to complement GDP measures with indicators that encompass environmental and social aspects of progress<sup>2</sup>. In the case of social areas, more data are needed on distributional aspects and household perspective.

Finally, the European Commission recently underlined the need to consider social indicators at a par with macroeconomic indicators. There is also a need to integrate information on income, consumption and wealth and better link them with national accounts in order to support integrated analysis at the macroeconomic level

### **3. Context of the modernisation of social statistics**

In September 2011, the ESS adopted the Wiesbaden Memorandum on a “New conceptual design for household and social statistics”<sup>3</sup>. This memorandum calls for progress towards an overall common architecture for European social statistics together with actions on sampling frames, administrative data sources, measurement of quality of life and of the living conditions of population subgroups, time use and household budgets. In line with these orientations, Eurostat has been working on the modernisation of social statistics. The main objectives are to increase responsiveness to user needs, quality and efficiency.

The programme includes actions pushing towards integration of data collections, with standardisation of variables and modules, wider use of administrative data sources and improved statistical frames. The programme covers social microdata collections (collections based on samples), population statistics (including census) and mainly administratively-based statistics and accounts. The ongoing revision of EU-SILC is part of this program.

As far as microdata collection are concerned, it is planned that a Framework European Parliament and Council Regulation on “Integrated European Social Statistics” will cover all surveys stipulating all common elements and then dedicated delegated and implementing acts will set up more specific elements for all or each data collection.

### **4. Planned developments for EU-SILC**

#### **4.1 Purpose of EU-SILC revision**

The high priority given by the Council and the Commission to the fight against poverty and social exclusion in the European Union, even more in the context of the economic and financial crisis, requires comparable and as much as possible timely statistics to monitor this process. The demands concerning living conditions, income, inequalities, quality of life and integration with macroeconomics are also increasing. Hence, the requests for improving EU-SILC focus on:

The need for timely data, in particular in the crisis context where social impact of the policies are important, and in the context of the European Semester.

In addition to timely data, early estimates of relevant social indicators need to be developed as it is already the case in the area of national accounts and price statistics.

---

<sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> Communication from the Commission "GDP and beyond – Measuring progress in a changing world", COM(2009) 433 of 20.08.2009: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2009:0433:FIN:EN:PDF>.

<sup>3</sup> [https://www.destatis.de/EN/AboutUs/Events/DGINS/Document\\_Memorandum.pdf?\\_\\_blob=publicationFile](https://www.destatis.de/EN/AboutUs/Events/DGINS/Document_Memorandum.pdf?__blob=publicationFile)

The need for regional data in the context of the forthcoming monitoring and the allocation of funds on the basis of indicators derived from EU-SILC, as well as regional dimension of the EU2020 strategy.

The importance of dynamics of poverty and long term poverty measurement.

The necessity to cover the multidimensional aspects of living conditions, poverty and social exclusion. There are several requests that cannot any longer be accommodated in the current flexibility mechanism of the ad hoc modules (like more information on children, access to services, vulnerability, consumption and wealth, structure of the households, quality of life and well-being, health, more breakdowns of social benefits and transfers, social transfers in kind , etc.). However, the needs will continue to evolve, and flexibility is required.

The investigation for the inclusion of more social indicators in the context of macroeconomic assessment (e.g., MIP - Macroeconomic Imbalance Procedure - where so far AROPE and its components are only included as auxiliary indicators) and more generally more integration of social and macroeconomics data.

The increased use of administrative data for the income components and the often associated problems of delays in their availability have also to be noticed. New data collection modes and sources shall be also considered (web interviews, matching).

As a consequence, the objective is to re-design the EU-SILC so as to:

- ✓ Increase its responsiveness to new policy needs, currently and for the future.
- ✓ Deliver data faster and provide information useful for early estimates.
- ✓ Maintain the stability of the main indicators, with adapted frequency and keeping a cross-cutting approach.
- ✓ Maintain and if possible slightly decrease the burden and the costs.
- ✓ Allow sufficient regional breakdown.
- ✓ Ensure adequate accuracy and quality of measurements.
- ✓ Adapt to multi-modes and multi-sources data collections.
- ✓ Allow better integration of its data.

Ensure a general consistency of the different element of the tool (e.g. frequency of non-annual modules and length of the longitudinal component)

#### **4.2 Approach of EU-SILC revision**

The main directions retained in a global equilibrium are the following:

- ✓ To modularise the content of EU-SILC and better adapt the periodicity of collection of the modules to the needs. This implies the less frequent collection of data that are not absolutely needed yearly. Currently, about 135 non-technical variables are really collected from the households or the registers in the yearly EU-SILC and about 20-25 in the ad hoc modules. The project is to collect only 115 variables yearly ("nucleus" covering income, some labour data, deprivation – as part of the Europe 2020 framework - and additional variables on health, child care, education, housing costs and quality of life). The space left empty by the removal of the 40-45 other variables will be used for fixed rotating modules with a periodicity of 3 years for the variables dealing with labour, health, children and housing and with a periodicity of 6 years for the others (social participation, quality of life, access to services, wealth and debt, consumption, intergenerational transmission of disadvantages and possibly past experience of homelessness). Each module will contain about 20-25 variables. Some of the 6 year modules will be dedicated to new policy needs and will be changing. In the first wave, stable variables will be also collected (e.g., country of birth and education of parents, in the context of migration and intergenerational transmission). See table 1.
- ✓ To improve timeliness, by shortening the global availability of EU-SILC by 6 months (from December N+1 to June N+1), by collecting earlier material deprivation (and all other available non-income data, if possible) at the end of the reference period N (or very beginning of N+1), by

introducing elements in the collection that would be useful to estimate the evolutions of income distribution, and by maximising the possibilities of micro-simulation for early estimates.

✓ To extend the rotational panel from 4 to 6 years, so as to have better estimations of the persistent risk of poverty indicator, which will then be based on a sample size double than what is currently feasible, and study transitions and recurrences of poverty and social exclusion. However, some analysis and tests are still needed on this issue.

✓ To allow for more regional breakdowns, on a country based approach. This would combine several solutions, including 3 years averaging, re-design of the sample, modelling and calibration, and in limited cases, increased sample size.

✓ To increase the possibilities for linking and matching data with other data collections or estimations: harmonisation of variables including a household grid, additional information for instance for social transfer in kind estimation, short modules on wealth and if feasible on consumption, to get better data on joint distributions of income, consumption and wealth. Further needs for integration and reconciliation of social and macroeconomics data and indicators will be also taken into account.

✓ To define precision requirements in a way that facilitates compliance assessment based on the standard error to be achieved. This would have as an effect a precision of about +/- 1 percentage points (pp) for the largest Member-States and about +/- 1.5 pp for the smallest ones for the main indicators (in particular for AROPE) at national level and about +/- 2.5 pp at regional level (in terms of 95% confidence interval). A requirement will also be placed on the longitudinal component.

✓ To improve other elements, like the quality reports, the tracing rules, the metadata on sources of data, etc., also promoting best practices.

✓ To promote an integrated approach for the use of registers and multi-mode data collection, for instance by allowing whenever possible, interview time compatible with CATI (telephone interview), when income is available in registers, and/or CAWI (web interview). This integrated approach should take in good account the possible comparability issues related to registers and multi-mode data collection and timeliness issues related to use of registers.

Better integration with macroeconomics will be also an aim, while exact elements needed form SILC still need to be further defined.

*Table 1: Structure of the contents of the revised EU-SILC*

<b>Nucleus (all years) (EU2020, main indicators)</b>	<b>Y E A R</b>	<b>Every 3-year modules Max. 20 var. each, indicative order only</b>	<b>Every 6-year modules Max. 20 var. each, indicative order only</b>
Income	1	Health	Quality of life, social & cultural participation
(revised) Material Deprivation	2	Children	New policy needs 1
Economic activity	3	Labour & housing conditions	Over-indebtedness, wealth, consumption
Demography	4	Health	New policy needs 2
Education	5	Children	Access to services, social transfers in kind
Child care	6	Labour & housing conditions	Intergenerational & Homelessness?/New policy 3
Housing costs			
Health			
Quality of Life			
1st wave			
Miscellaneous			

### 4.3 Use of results from research

The research community is very active on EU-SILC. The User Data Base (UDB) is available to researchers and allows focused analyses and developments that are useful for the continuous improvement of the EU-SILC instrument. In particular a lot of EU-SILC methodological work was undertaken in the framework of the 26 working packages of Net-SILC2. Some of the findings of those packages are in the process of being directly applied, or under consideration for future developments in the EU-SILC production process. Three examples are described in this paper:

- ✓ Standard error estimation of EU-SILC based indicators.
- ✓ Improved measure of material deprivation.
- ✓ EUROMOD micro-simulation.

#### *4.3.1 Standard error estimation of EU-SILC based indicators*

Given the high policy relevance of EU-SILC, there is increasing demand from the stakeholders for accuracy measures of the published indicators and for measures of the significance of net change of indicators over time for correct monitoring of the evolution of social exclusion phenomena. As EU-SILC is a complex survey involving different sampling design in different countries, "to the book" standard methods for calculating accuracy measures are not directly applicable. Eurostat, taking stock of the research performed by Net-SILC2 has put in place the simple method for standard error estimation based on linearization and coupled with the ultimate cluster approach. The method, implemented in a first time to shares indicators is to be extended in 2015 to other non-linear indicators (e.g., ratios).

Eurostat has applied the method for estimating the standard error and confidence intervals on the indicator AROPE (At-risk-of poverty or social exclusion). This indicator is the proportion of persons being in one or more of the three following situations: at-risk-of poverty, i.e. below the national poverty threshold (60% of median national equivalised income), severely materially deprived, living in a household with very low work intensity. The indicator was considered as a proportion making the assumption that the poverty threshold is a fixed amount and equal to the point estimate. According to the characteristics and availability of data for different countries different variables were used to specify strata and cluster information.

In particular, countries have been split into three groups:

- ✓ Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Ireland, Greece, Spain, France, Croatia, Italy, Latvia, Hungary, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia and the United Kingdom whose sampling design could be assimilated to a two stage stratified type for which DB050 (primary strata) is used for strata specification and DB060 (Primary Sampling Unit) for cluster specification;
- ✓ Germany, Estonia, Cyprus, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Austria, Slovakia, Finland and Switzerland whose sampling design could be assimilated to a one stage stratified type for which DB050 is used for strata specification and DB030 (household ID) for cluster specification;
- ✓ Denmark, Malta, Sweden, Island and Norway, whose sampling design could be assimilated to a simple random sampling, for which DB030 is used for cluster specification and no strata.

The approach used can take account of stratification, multi-stage selection, unequal probabilities of inclusion for the sample units and re-weighting for unit non-response. However it does not reflect the gain in accuracy caused by weighting calibration. The effect of calibration on variance could be significant especially in the countries where powerful auxiliary information from income registers has been used to adjust the sampling weights. This in some cases may lead to overestimation of sampling errors.

Results are shown in Table 2 and demonstrate the overall good accuracy of SILC data. The survey has in fact been designed to yield a 95% confidence interval of around 1 percentage point around a hypothetical poverty rate of 15%.

**Table 2: AROPE indicator, standard error and 95% confidence intervals (2013)  
(per cent and percentage points (pp))**

	AROPE 2013	Standard Error - ppt	Confidence Interveal 95% - Lower Boundary	Confidence Interveal 95% - Upper Boundary
EU 28	24.5	0.2	24.2	24.9
Belgium	20.8	0.9	19.2	22.5
Bulgaria	48.0	1.1	45.8	50.2
Czech Republic	14.6	0.6	13.4	15.8
Denmark	18.9	1.0	17.0	20.9
Germany	20.3	0.4	19.7	21.0
Estonia	23.5	0.7	22.2	24.9
Ireland	29.5	0.9	27.8	31.3
Greece	35.7	0.9	34.0	37.4
Spain	27.3	0.6	26.0	28.6
France	18.1	0.5	17.1	19.1
Croatia	29.9	1.0	27.9	31.9
Italy	28.4	0.5	27.4	29.5
Cyprus	27.8	0.8	26.2	29.4
Latvia	35.1	1.1	32.8	37.5
Lithuania	30.8	1.1	28.8	32.9
Luxembourg	19.0	0.9	17.2	20.8
Hungary	33.5	0.9	31.8	35.3
Malta	24.0	0.8	22.4	25.6
Netherlands	15.9	0.9	14.1	17.7
Austria	18.8	0.7	17.5	20.1
Poland	25.8	0.6	24.7	26.9
Portugal	27.4	0.9	25.6	29.3
Romania	40.4	1.2	38.0	42.8
Slovenia	20.4	0.5	19.4	21.4
Slovakia	19.8	0.7	18.3	21.2
Finland	16.0	0.4	15.2	16.8
Sweden	16.4	0.5	15.4	17.4
United Kingdom	24.8	0.7	23.5	26.1

Source: EU-SILC

The same approach has been used to calculate variance of net change for 2008-2013. In order to monitor the process towards agreed policy goals, particularly in the context of the Europe 2020 strategy, users are particularly interested in the evolution of social indicators. However, interpreting differences between point estimates at different wave may be misleading. It is therefore necessary to estimate the standard error for these differences in order to judge whether or not the observed differences are statistically significant.

Estimated standard errors and confidence intervals (based on normality assumption) for net changes in the AROPE between 2008 and 2013 are shown in Table 3. If a confidence interval does not include 0, we can say the difference in the AROPE between 2008 and 2013 is statistically significant (at a given level of confidence). The calculations were not

possible for all countries for technical reasons, unavailability of data at the extraction date or break in time series for changes in data collection methodology.

**Table 3: Estimated standard errors for net change in the AROPE between 2008 and 2013 (per cent and percentage points (pp))**

	AROPE 2008	AROPE 2013	Change (2013) - (2008)	Estimated standard error - ppt	Confidence Interval 95% - Lower Boundary	Confidence Interval 95% - Upper Boundary	Is the difference significant?	
EU 27 (1)	23.8	24.5	0.7	0.2	0.2	1.2	Y	
Belgium	20.8	20.8	0.0	1.2	-2.3	2.3	N	
Bulgaria	44.8	48.0	3.2	1.6	0.0	6.4	Y (borderline)	
Czech Republic	15.3	14.6	-0.7	0.8	-2.3	0.9	N	
Denmark	16.3	18.9	2.6	1.2	0.2	5.0	Y	
Germany	20.1	20.3	0.2	0.5	-0.7	1.1	N	
Estonia	21.8	23.5	1.7	1.0	-0.2	3.6	N	
Ireland	23.7	29.5	5.9	1.5	3.0	8.7	Y	
Greece	28.1	35.7	7.6	1.2	5.3	9.9	Y	
Spain	24.5	27.3	break in time series					
France	18.5	18.1	-0.4	0.8	-1.9	1.1	N	
Croatia (1)	:	29.9	no data in 2008					
Italy	25.3	28.4	3.1	0.7	1.7	4.5	Y	
Cyprus	23.3	27.8	4.5	1.2	2.1	6.9	Y	
Latvia	34.2	35.1	0.9	1.5	-2.1	3.9	N	
Lithuania	27.6	30.8	3.2	1.6	0.0	6.4	N (borderline)	
Luxembourg	15.5	19.0	3.5	1.4	0.8	6.2	Y	
Hungary	28.2	33.5	5.3	1.0	3.3	7.3	Y	
Malta	20.1	24.0	3.9	1.1	1.7	6.1	Y	
Netherlands	14.9	15.9	1.0	1.2	-1.4	3.4	N	
Austria (2)	20.6	18.8	-1.8	1.0	-3.7	0.1	Y (borderline)	
Poland	30.5	25.8	-4.7	0.8	-6.2	-3.2	Y	
Portugal	26.0	27.4	1.4	1.4	-1.4	4.2	N	
Romania	44.2	40.4	-3.8	1.7	-7.1	-0.5	Y	
Slovenia	18.5	20.4	1.9	0.7	0.5	3.3	Y	
Slovakia	20.6	19.8	-0.8	1.0	-2.7	1.1	N	
Finland	17.4	16.0	-1.4	0.6	-2.6	-0.2	Y	
Sweden	14.9	16.4	1.5	0.7	0.1	2.9	Y	
United Kingdom	23.2	24.8	break in time series					

(1) Croatia was not member of the EU in 2008

(2) No stratification is assumed

Source: EU-SILC

In the context of the revision of EU-SILC, and more generally the Framework Regulation on “Integrated European Social Statistics” for all social microdata survey collections, precision requirement will be based on the standard error. On the AROPE indicator (cross-sectional) a confidence interval ranging from around 1 pp for larger countries to 1.5 pp for smallest ones will be accepted. For the regional level the desired requirements would be to have a confidence interval for the AROPE indicator at  $\pm 2.5$  pp. It is planned to use the calculation method as explained above to assess Member States compliance for the precision of their EU-SILC data.

#### ***4.3.2 Improved measure of material deprivation***

In the context of the EU2020 strategy, for monitoring the progress toward the achievement of the poverty target, the Council agreed on the At-risk-of poverty or social exclusion indicator (AROPE) reflecting the multidimensional nature of poverty and social exclusion. As mentioned above, this target indicator is made of the aggregation of 3 sub-indicators measuring respectively the share of the population at-risk-of poverty, in a situation of severe material deprivation and living in very low work intensity households. Severely materially deprived households are those deprived of at least 4 among 9 items measured in the EU-SILC. The Council also decided that the mid-term review of the EU headline target in 2015 would include a review of the indicators and more specifically, improved measures of material deprivation.

Net-SILC2 has proceeded to an in depth analysis of 50 material deprivation items available in total in the 2009 EU-SILC, which included a detailed ad hoc module dedicated to this subject. This study analysed the dimensional structure of the whole set of 50 items as well as their suitability, validity, reliability and additivity. The aggregation of deprivation items was also analysed in depth and robust indicators for the whole population and for children were envisaged. On this basis Member States and Eurostat agreed on a tentative list of 7 new material deprivation variables for the whole population (to be used together with 6 of the current 9 SILC primary variables on material deprivation for setting up indicators for the whole population) and 13 material deprivation variables for children (to be used with 7 adults items for setting up children material deprivation indicators). In order to better observe the behaviour of the former and the proposed new variables and indicators two new ad hoc data collection were launched in EU-SILC (2013 ESS agreement, 2014 and 2015 ad hoc modules). The ongoing analysis of their outcomes should lead to routine data collection of the new items for the whole population in EU-SILC from 2016 onwards and accordingly the adoption of an improved indicator for material deprivation. For their part, the children items will be collected in one of the every 3-year modules of the revised EU-SILC.

#### ***4.3.3 micro-simulation and early estimates***

As explained above, in the context of improving timeliness of social indicators, model based estimations would be a valid solution to go further and answer the demand of "nearly real time" information on poverty and social exclusion and on evolution of income distribution. For example, estimating by means of now-casting or forecasting methods some key indicators such as the Europe 2020 headline indicators could be a valid approach to reduce the time lag between the release of estimates and final figures.

One way to explore is micro-simulation, a methodological approach that is becoming increasingly relevant and increasingly used at national level to build policy scenarios. It can draw together information from microdata, policy changes and external information (e.g. on labour market evolutions) in order to forecast at micro level (each individual or household) the evolution of a certain indicator.

In the case of EU-SILC, micro-simulation models would allow to take into account changes in tax and benefit policy, employment and demography and to project them to a period of time posterior to the survey reference year, filling in this way the temporal gap between the income reference period and the release of the data.

EUROMOD is a tax-benefit micro-simulation model developed by ISER-University of Essex. The big strength of this model is its continuous update for each EU country by local teams. In the framework of Net-SILC2, the possibility to use EUROMOD to evaluate the effects of policy and other changes on the prospects for meeting the 2020 target for poverty and social exclusion have been explored. In particular, experiments on using EUROMOD for now-casting EU-SILC based indicators have been performed and will be finalised for all EU countries by the end of 2015. EU-SILC is also trying to implement progressively better information needed by the EUROMOD model as it uses directly SILC data as input. Possibly other information collected in EU social surveys could be improved for this purpose. These experiences and improvements will be very valuable for assessing the

feasibility to use micro-simulation for releasing early estimates of EU-SILC based indicators to satisfy the increasing policy demands.

## 5 Implementation

The main re-design of EU-SILC (in particular its content side) cannot be implemented without a new legal act. Therefore, for the content and the panel length of SILC, it is foreseen to introduce the changes in the context of the adoption of the Framework Regulation on “Integrated European Social Statistics”.

However, for the progresses on timeliness and regionalisation, this would be a gradual move, with national action plans over the next years starting in the context of the current EU-SILC.

For timeliness, already now, early data on material deprivation has started to be collected. In the first months of 2014 for the reference year 2013, data was collected for 16 Member States and two EFTA countries. These data were published in the Statistics Explained article "Material deprivation statistics - early results" in June 2014. In 2015 the same data was collected and published on 30 March<sup>4</sup>; however, one should keep in mind that, in some cases, there may be discrepancies between provisional and final data but the first experienced gained so far shows that the provisional data are very similar to the final ones.

Several countries are also progressively implementing the June N+1 deadline over the period 2014 to 2016. Actually in 2014, 7 Member States were able to provide 2013 cross-sectional data before the end of June 2014 (against 4 Member States in 2013 for the 2012 data). More generally, although not achieving yet the target, it should be noted that all Member States but Ireland sent the 2013 cross-sectional data before mid-October for the first time ever.

## 6 Conclusions

The expectations on high quality and timely data to analyse the social situation have increased among users and in particular policy makers, as a consequence of the economic crisis. EU-SILC being the main data source for comparative analysis and indicators on income and living conditions in the EU is in this context particularly solicited for answering new demands.

The modernization of social statistics and in this context the revision of EU-SILC tries to respond to these demands while securing modern and viable foundations in the governance of the instrument in the European Statistical System. This process tackles also some specific aspects of EU-SILC needing improvements. The full implementation of the revised EU-SILC will be achieved at the end of the decade as it needs long and difficult processes both at legal and technical level. However, both Eurostat and the statistical Offices of the EU Member States and their neighbour countries are carrying out important works in order to implement all changes already possible in the context of the current EU-SILC. In particular some strands, such as timeliness or regionalization are already being implemented in the current EU-SILC in order to duly answer current policy needs. Further integration with other sources of data relevant for analysing the social situation should also be explored, in particular in the domain of national and sectorial accounts.

The complexity of EU-SILC makes also indispensable the use of results developed by researchers. It was showed through some examples how the contributions from Net-SILC2 have in a tangible way already helped to further improve some aspects of EU-SILC also answering requests from the main policy users for higher quality and more timely data on poverty and social exclusion. Better measurement of variance has been implemented, work for preparing early estimates methodology is starting and the improved measurement of material deprivation will be implemented on a systematic basis from 2016 onwards

-----

---

<sup>4</sup> See : [http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Material\\_deprivation\\_statistics\\_-\\_early\\_results](http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Material_deprivation_statistics_-_early_results)