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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 very 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)
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 form 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 then 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 then once a year

Once again discuss with key users