

Revision energy statistics

Policy and practice

Country practice of the Netherlands

Hans Pouwelse

May 2014



Statistics
Netherlands

Revision policy

Two possible approaches

- 1 Implement changes as soon as it is possible/necessary
- 2 Collect changes and implement only on previously announced moments, for instance once every 5 years

1 Implement changes as soon as it is possible/necessary

Pro

- Always best data available for users

Contra

- Published figures may change regularly, on irregular moments; unstable dataset

2 Collect changes and implement only on previously announced moments

Pro

- Figures do not change often; stable dataset

Contra

- Not always best data available for users

preference of main users

- Two approaches presented in a special meeting with key users of energy statistics
- What do you prefer?
- No unanimous preference
- Policy makers tend to 1: give always the best available data
- Scientists preference to 2: stable dataset more practical to refer to in scientific work

Chosen policy

- Revision approach 2:
Collect changes and implement once every 5 years
- In fact continuation of revision policy in the past
- Planned revision: 2012
- Revision energy data back to (at least) 1995
- Primary focus on data energy balance (annual)

Implementation revision 2012

Main causes for revision:

- Improve harmonisation with international definitions and classifications (EU, IEA, UN)
- New and better data sources
especially: client files of energy companies (country practice in ESCM, presentation OG Helsinki)
- Improving presentation renewables in energy balance
- Changed approach petrochemical industry ('chemical' products removed, presentation OG Baku)
- Correct mistakes

Implementation revision 2012

Challenges

- Extensive, voluminous project: many different subjects (more than 30!; varying from 0.1 to 50 PJ each)
- Several ICT-changes over the years (software and hardware); lots of extra work to make data from older years accessible and reproducible
- Many colleagues involved; work had to be done in between regular statistics production work (high workload by continuous budget cuts)

Implementation revision 2012

Findings

- Took much more time than intended:
to be finalised in 2014 (june) in stead of 2012!
- Important users become impatient
- Appeared to be too voluminous and too complex to handle with normal staff capacity

Concluding remarks / recommendations

Time to reconsider revision policy!

Looking for an intermediate approach between 1 and 2 depending on size and seriousness revision actions

For instance:

- flexible frequency
- at least if policy relevant data have to be changed substantially
- not more than once a year

Once again discuss with key users