EUROPEAN COMMISSION
EUROSTAT

Deputy Director-General
Unit 0-2: Statistical governance, quality and evaluation

Luxembourg, 08 March 2007

European Statistical System
Code of Practice Peer Reviews:

The National Statistical Institute's guide

(Version 1.3)

Introduction 2
What is the background of the peer review? 2
What is the purpose of the peer review? 3
What is the scope of the peer review? 4
Preparation of the peer review 5
Eurostat peer review desk 5
How do I contact the peer review team? 5
What kinds of documents are needed? 5
What about the user satisfaction survey? 7
What shall the programme of the visit comprise? 7
Peer review visit 8
How do I inform internal/external participants? 9
Peer review report 9
What is the NSI role in finalising the peer review report? 9
What will happen after the peer review report has been finalised? 10
Peer review checklist for NSIs 10
Annex I: Indicative timetable for ESS peer reviews 10
Annex II: Peer review programme - proposal 11
Annex III: User survey on key quality aspects 12
Annex IV: Description of the National Statistical System 18

Introduction

This guide is intended to help the National Statistical Institute (NSI) in preparing the peer review. Please read it carefully and do not hesitate to contact Martina Hahn or Solveiga Eidukynaitė, Eurostat unit 0-2, with any questions you may have. Any suggestions on how to improve this guide are also welcome!

What is the background of the peer review?

In February 2005 the Statistical Programme Committee adopted the European Statistics Code of Practice and committed itself to adhere to its principles. The Code of Practice presents an ambitious holistic approach to quality in statistics covering the institutional environment, statistical processes and statistical outputs[1]. It has the dual purpose of, on the one hand, improving trust and confidence in statistical authorities by proposing certain institutional and

[1] For more information on the European Statistics Code of Practice please consult the Eurostat quality website: http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/quality

organisational arrangements, and, on the other hand, reinforcing the quality of the statistics they produce and disseminate, by promoting the coherent application of best international statistical principles, methods and practices by all producers of official statistics in Europe.

At its meeting in May 2005 the Statistical Programme Committee agreed a stepwise monitoring procedure for the implementation of the Code over three years during which countries' self-assessments should be paired with elements of peer review, benchmarking and monitoring on the basis of the explanatory indicators added to each principle of the Code. A final report will be submitted to the European Parliament and to the Council in 2008.

As a first step, in 2005 the National Statistical Institutes and Eurostat carried a comprehensive self-assessment against the principles and indicators of the Code of Practice using the common Code of Practice self-assessment questionnaire which had been developed by the SPC Task Force on the implementation of the Code of Practice.

The results of these self-assessments have been summarised in a report to the Economic and Financial Committee published on the Eurostat quality website. It gives preliminary insight into adherence to the Code, highlights some good ESS practices and the progress so far with regard to implementing the Code. In its meeting of 10 May 2006 the EFC Sub-Committee on Statistics welcomed the report and underlined the exercise to be continued with peer reviews until the end of 2007.

The self-assessments provide the central basis for the ESS-wide peer reviews with the interviews following the structure of the self-assessment questionnaire and by allowing a National Statistical Institute to position itself in relation to ESS practices.

During March and April 2006 two pilot peer reviews have been carried out in the Czech Republic and the Netherlands to test the peer review methodology which has been finalised taking into account the comments of the SPC Task Force on the Implementation of the Code of Practice at its meeting on 17 May 2006 and the discussion at the Eurostat peer review information workshop for peers on 27 September 2006. It was further refined following the first ESS peer reviews.

What is the purpose of the peer review?

The European Statistical System peer reviews conducted in the framework of the implementation of the Code of Practice serve the following objectives:

Most importantly, the peer reviews introduce an external element in the implementation of the Code of Practice which otherwise follows a basically self-regulatory approach. It thus contributes to transparency of the process and accountability of those involved in it.

Peer reviews are carried out on the basis of the National Statistical Institutes and Eurostat self-assessments using the Code of Practice Questionnaires as a starting point. However, they are expected to go beyond this initial exercise, adding value by raising issues from a peer's perspective, going more into detail where needed and assessing the situation of the NSI in the national context. Areas for improvement and related actions identified in the self-assessments will be confirmed and given more shape with peers contributing to their prioritisation where needed.

At the same time, countries – assisted by the peers - benefit from more detailed overviews of the results of the first European Statistical System self-assessments positioning themselves in the European Statistical System with regard to the degrees and modes of adhering to the Code's principles. The peer review could thus stimulate a knowledge transfer from which all parties involved could benefit by identifying benchmarks and sharing best practices. Peers and participating NSIs are therefore called upon to highlight good practices to be brought to the attention of the European Statistical System.

As a result the peer reviews yield a report at country level focussing on the principles reviewed. The report also includes a refined set of improvement actions covering all principles of the Code which are being used to feed the process of monitoring the implementation of the Code in the European Statistical System.

Peer reviews contribute to a more complete picture of adherence to the Code at European Statistical System level identifying any common difficulties or gaps with regard to compliance with the Code. These issues will be taken up at Statistical Programme Committee level.

What is the scope of the peer review?

The peer review exercise covers all European Union Member States. In addition, the European Union Candidate Countries and the European Economic Area – European Free Trade Association Countries will also participate. The reviews are carried out during a three-day country visit by teams of three persons comprising two experts from National Statistical Institutes and one from Eurostat.

The scope of the peer reviews is limited to the parts of the Code dealing with the institutional environment and dissemination, based on the following principles: (1) Professional Independence, (2) Mandate for data collection, (3) Adequacy of resources, (4) Quality commitment, (5) Statistical confidentiality, (6) Impartiality and objectivity and (15) Accessibility and clarity.

In addition, certain selected additional issues relating to other principles of the Code or specific statistical areas could be reviewed in individual countries taking into account inter alia preferences indicated by NSIs in the reply to the self-assessment questionnaire and the composition of the reviewer team. When agreeing the details of the peer review with Eurostat a NSI may request additional issues to be reviewed.

As a compromise between keeping the review manageable while at the same time assessing the situation in a dispersed national statistical system, the peer review will also address the **co-ordination role of the NSI within the system**. In principle, this will be done taking into account the relevant legal and policy framework as well as the relating de facto co-ordination mechanism and bodies and their functioning in practice.

It is not part of the scope of this peer review exercise to review on-site national producers of statistics other than the National Statistical Institute. In principle the peer review is expected to cover the NSI only, including its co-ordination role within the national statistical system. While other national data providers should participate in the review to complete the picture, it would be the role of the NSI to assess their compliance status. To this end, NSIs were asked by Eurostat in May 2006 to report on their plans to extend the implementation of the Code to other national providers of statistics.

Preparation of the peer review

Eurostat peer review desk

Unit O-2 of Eurostat has established a peer review desk (Martina Hahn and Solveiga Eidukynaitė) to be contacted for all questions related to the peer reviews. The desk co-operates closely with the NSIs and the peer review teams in preparing and managing the peer review and in providing quality assurance for the process and the results. This will involve in particular:

- collection of relevant information prior to the peer review;
- guidance with regard to the definition of the peer review programme;
- assistance in ensuring the Eurostat methodology is applied in such a way that assessments can be compared from one report to another, including e.g. advice to peer review teams on draft peer review reports.

How do I contact the peer review team?

Prior to the peer review, Eurostat, peer review desk will contact the NSI to agree the dates of the visit and discuss its tentative scope. NSIs will be requested to name a contact for the organisation of the peer review. Eurostat will then propose a peer review team to the NSI drawing from the list provided by the Statistical Programme Committee and designate a chairperson. To finalise the programme and provide further information as far as necessary, in principle the NSI will then communicate with the chair of the peer review team, with the other team members and Eurostat, peer review desk in copy.

What kinds of documents are needed?

To allow the peer review team to prepare itself and in view of agreeing the programme of the visit, the provision to Eurostat of all relevant information in English language prior to the peer review is essential. **The most important document in this context is the countries' reply to the <u>CoP self-assessment questionnaire including its tentative list of improvement actions for all principles of the Code.</u> Those NSIs which have not yet reflected upon improvement actions for all principles are requested to complete the self-assessment questionnaire as soon as possible and well in advance of the peer review.**

The list below gives an orientation of documents to serve the preparation of the peer review:

Information	To be provided by	comments
• NSI reply to Code of Practice self-assessment questionnaire • Information on how the NSI has carried out its self-assessment • Detailed overview of the NSI's position in relation to the ESS average based on the self-assessments of all NSIs and Eurostat	Eurostat	The reply to the self-assessment questionnaire provides the central basis for the peer review. NSIs which have not yet completed a first indication of improvement actions in their reply to the CoP self-assessment questionnaire covering all principles of the CoP shall do so as soon as possible and send the completed version to ESTAT QUALITY.
• Reports from similar exercises	Eurostat (global assessment report, IMF Data ROSC report); NSI: other peer review report	Where applicable
• NSI reply to the Eurostat questionnaire on the institutional set-up	Eurostat	
• Brief (max. 2 pages) description of the national statistical system	NSI	This document (in EN) will be presented on the Eurostat website together with the peer review report
• Statistical Law	NSI	Translation into EN is required
• Other relevant legislation incl. on Statistical Council	NSI	Translation of relevant Articles or summary in EN
• Results of the NSI's user satisfaction survey	NSI	As far as possible results should be presented by user group and by statistical domain (see below)
• Organisation chart of the NSI	NSI	

• NSI policy documents
  • vision, mission statement
  • data protection, confidentiality
  • dissemination
  • quality
  • process / project management
  • training
  • master plan / future strategy
  • annual reports / business plans
  • other
	NSI	As far as applicable

• National Code of Practice	NSI	Where applicable
• Service level agreements or similar documents describing access to administrative data or co-operation within the national statistical system	NSI	Where applicable
• Statistical Programme	NSI	
• List of surveys	NSI	
• List of which administrative data are used for which statistics	NSI	
• Information on staffing, staff recruitment and training	NSI	
• Copy of the last advertisement for the post of the head of the NSI	NSI	
• Information on finance and budgeting	NSI	
• Publication plan	NSI	
• Compliance with EU statistical legislation	Eurostat / NSI	
• NSI website		
• Brief information on strategic bilateral co-operation projects with other NSIs/peers	NSI	Where applicable
• Any other information	NSI	NSI is most welcome to submit to Eurostat any further information considered useful for the preparation of the peer review team
• Hotel recommendations for members of peer review team close to the NSI / within easy reach of public transport	NSI	

The members of the peer review team will be informed that information is for use in the framework of the peer review only and should not be distributed any further without explicit consent of the NSI. The NSI will be kept informed on the information provided by Eurostat, peer review desk, to the members of the peer review team.

What about the user satisfaction survey?

Prior to their peer review National Statistical Institutes are requested to conduct on a small scale a survey among main national users / user groups of European statistics in order to obtain some insight on how key aspects of quality are being perceived for selected national products forming part of European statistics, like e.g. the employment figures, national accounts, etc.

The (aggregated) results of the survey will serve as an input to the peer reviews. They are expected to provide a broader picture on users' opinion than could possibly be obtained from the few interviews envisaged during the on-site visit of the peers. In so far, they will help to focus and substantiate any discussions during the peer review.

In order to keep the survey manageable and modest in terms of investment needed by the National Statistical Institute, the target population comprises (known) users from the academic and research community, banks and business, government agencies, the national Parliaments, the media, the international community and other relevant user groups, specific to the selected statistical domains. The NSI is of course free to adjust the sample size according to their own needs and also to extend it to other users than those mentioned above.

Details on the methodology are presented in Annex III. NSIs already performing (on a regular basis) a similar survey can use the results of this survey.

What shall the programme of the visit comprise?

It is recommended to start the visit with representatives of the NSI's management being guided by the peer review team through the self-assessment questionnaire. It is necessary to go systematically through the whole list of indicators for the selected principles, because ultimately the report has to give a judgement for each individual indicator.

This initial assessment is to be substantiated by discussions with both internal and external representatives. The selection of stakeholders/ institutions/ persons to be interviewed needs careful consideration in particular with a view to ensuring a proper coverage of partners that can provide an outside view. Small (around 10 persons), representative groups of stakeholders will tend to provide the most useful feedback. It is important to organise a meeting with some journalists as this helps the peer review team to understand how the activities of the NSI are perceived from outside the national statistical system.

Good experiences have been made in discussing the implementation of the Code not only with senior management but as well with junior staff comprising staff with some 2-5 years experience in the NSI and its functioning in the institutional environment but who are not yet part of middle management (The presence of a senior member of staff or the NSI's organiser of the peer review a the rather informal discussion is to be discouraged so as not to restrict an open discussion). A range of users should be selected, embracing the major statistical domains and covering primary, secondary (analysts) and tertiary (media) users.

Enough time should be set aside on the third (and final) day to allow detailed discussion with top management of a ***preliminary*** set of recommendations and conclusions including improvement actions for all principles of the Code of Practice. The final report should include agreed and validated improvement actions with a timetable for their implementation.

Based on the experience gained during the two pilot peer reviews, Annex II suggests how a peer review programme could be organised subject to adjustments to take account of the situation of individual countries.

Peer review visit

So as not to overburden either the team or the NSI, the review will not exceed three working days. Within this tight schedule the chair of the peer review need to run the meeting carefully and suggestions for ad hoc presentations by the NSI will be evaluated for their potential value to the peer review (notwithstanding their undoubted interest on a more general level). In the same vein, lengthy introductory presentations from the side of the organisation/stakeholder interviewed should be avoided.

As far as possible, the peer review teams will undertake to compile by the end of the second day ***preliminary*** conclusions and recommendations to be discussed in detail with top management including a list of improvement actions based on the NSI's own list. This go through will also cover the principles of the Code of Practice which have not been reviewed.

It is important to note that during the discussion the NSI will have the opportunity to *comment* on the ***preliminary*** assessment of the peers and their recommendation and to *agree* the list of improvement actions and attach a timetable for their implementation. NSI should be aware that the preliminary assessments may be subject to changes until the report is finalised. This may include changes that become necessary in the course of the quality assurance of the process, e.g. to ensure a high degree of harmonisation with other peer review teams' assessments. However, it should be noted that certain limitations with regard to the comparability across peer review reports will have to be accepted given the differences in the composition of peer review teams.

Identification of good or best practices should become a systematic by-product of the review. This does not need to be at the indicator level, could concern a particular process or product, and should be inspiring for other NSIs. Good/best practices will be given some visibility at the end of the review process and will be covered in the report.

How do I inform internal/external participants?

Information on the purpose of the peer review and the Code of Practice should be distributed by the NSI to internal and external stakeholders participating in the review.

For this purpose some copies of the Code of Practice brochure in EN/FR/DE can be requested from Eurostat (please contact Estat-Quality[2]), for which information is also available on how to replicate the layout in order to print further copies or to produce another language version. Some NSIs may wish to circulate the results of their self-assessment internally and externally. While no common practice is foreseen, peers should be informed prior to their visit to whom the self-assessment has been disseminated.

Peer review report

What is the NSI role in finalising the peer review report?

The peer review report will follow a standardised format: The level of compliance with the Code of Practice will be assessed for each individual indicator of the principles covered in the peer review. An overall summary by principle will facilitate reading of the report. As far as applicable, the report will also address the NSI's co-ordination role in the statistical system and highlight good practices. An agreed list of improvement actions covering all principles of the Code will be annexed to the report.

Once the draft peer review report has been finalised by the peer review team, the report will be sent to Eurostat peer review desk which may suggest modifications to the team on the draft report, e.g. to increase its harmonisation with the other peer review reports. However, it should be noted that certain limitations with regard to the comparability across peer review reports will have to be accepted given the differences in the composition of peer review teams.

Then the report will be sent to the NSI for comments / observations and to provide as far as necessary supplementary information. The NSI will be requested as well to indicate - where still necessary - a timeframe for the implementation of the improvement actions identified. However, while improvement actions should be proposed by and agreed with the NSI, **it is important to note that ownership of the report (and the assessment) lies with the peer review team, only**.

In case the NSI proposes changes to the peer review report that the peer review team can not agree with and no consensus can be reached between the NSI and the team, the NSI will be given the opportunity to have its comments published on the Eurostat website together with the team's final report. This should be in exceptional circumstances only.

To facilitate comprehension of the report to be published on the Eurostat website, it will be accompanied by a short (1-2 pages) description in English of the statistical system. A template

[2] mailto:ESTAT-QUALITY@ec.europa.eu

for this description is available in Annex IV. This description is to be provided by the NSI to Eurostat, peer review desk.

What will happen after the peer review report has been finalised?

Together with the short description of the NSI and the national statistical system provided by the NSI (see Annex IV), the finalised version of the peer review report including the list of improvement actions covering all principles of the Code will be published on the Eurostat website under the section "European Statistical System compliance with the Code of Practice". Presumably once per year, Eurostat will ask the NSI to report on the implementation of the improvement actions in line with the envisaged time frame.

Peer review checklist for NSIs

8-10 weeks before the peer review

1. Has a contact person been nominated for the peer review and communicated to Eurostat, peer review desk?
2. Did the peer review team receive hotel information?
3. Is the NSI self-assessment complete? Have – preliminary- improvement actions been identified for *all* principles?
4. Has a user satisfaction survey been carried out?
5. Are all important documents translated into English?

4 weeks before the peer review

6. Have all relevant documents/information been sent to Eurostat?
7. Organisational arrangements fixed?

2-3 weeks before the peer review

8. Has the programme been agreed with the peer review team?
9. Have all stakeholders/participants been invited?

Annex I: Indicative timetable for ESS peer reviews

2006	2007
	January: 22-24 IE + 24-26 FR
	March: IS+ LV+ SE
March: 29-31 CZ PILOT	April: BG+ PL + LT
April: 4-6 NL PILOT	May: SI + HU+DK
	June: NO
	July: SK+BE
	August: FI
	September: UK
September: 27 Information seminar for peers	October: EL + RO
October: 23-25 IT	November: ES+ DE
November: 6-8 EE, 22-24 AT	December: PT + LI + LU
December: 13-15 CY	

Annex II: Peer review programme - proposal[3]

1st day	**Discussion with internal stakeholders**
09.30 – 10.00	Welcome and introduction of programme, organisational matters
10.00 – 11.30	Meeting with management and senior staff, Principles 1, 2, 3
11.30 – 12.00	Meeting with management and senior staff, Principle 5
12.00 – 12.30	Meeting with management and senior staff, Principles 6, 15
12.30 – 13.30	Lunch break
13.30 – 14.30	Interview with DG and Quality manager, Principle 4
14.30 – 15.30	Meeting with junior staff, principles 1-6, 15
15.30 – 17.00	For example: Meeting with management to review additional issues on request of NSI or Meetings with Directors from production units to review specific aspects in practice or Presentation of strategic master plan / results of user-satisfaction survey or Meeting with representatives from regional (branch) offices
2nd day	**Discussion with external stakeholders** (could be grouped together)
09.30 – 10.30	Meeting other national data producers (Ministries, regional offices)
10.30 – 11.30	Meeting with main users / other national data producers (Ministries, National Central Bank)
11.30 – 12.30	Meeting with main users / other national data producers (representatives from Statistical Council etc.)
12.30 – 13.30	Lunch
14.00 – 15.00	Meeting with main users (representatives from university or other)
15.00 –16.00	Meeting with media
15:00 – 17:00	Meeting with representatives of respondents
3rd day	**Conclusions**
09.30 – 11.30	Meeting with management to sum-up and detailed review of list of improvement actions for all principles
11.30 – 13.00	Meeting with top management: conclusions, recommendations and follow-up (improvement actions)

3 NSIs' peer review programmes should be tailored to individual countries' situations and be agreed with the peer review teams.

Annex III: User survey on key quality aspects

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
EUROSTAT

Deputy Director-General
Unit 0-2: Statistical governance, quality and evaluation

User survey on key quality aspects

1. Objectives of the survey

In the framework of the peer reviews to be conducted in the European Statistical System during 2006/07, National Statistical Institutes will be asked to conduct on a small scale a survey among main national users / user groups of European statistics in order to obtain some insight on how key aspects of quality are being perceived for selected national products forming part of European statistics, like e.g. the employment figures, national accounts, etc.

The (aggregated) results of the survey will serve as an input to the peer reviews. They are expected to provide a broader picture on users' opinion than could possibly be obtained from the few interviews envisaged during the on-site visit of the peers. In so far, they will help to focus and substantiate any discussions during the peer review. In addition, they may build a basis for comparison over time or even – cautiously interpreted - across countries helping to tailor the implementation of the Code to areas where improvements seem to be needed most.

The suggested methodology largely builds upon a corresponding survey requested by the International Monetary Funds (IMF) prior to a country's Data Review of Standards and Codes (Data ROSC)[4]. It thus relies on a tested and widely used set of questions. While the statistical areas covered have been adjusted to better reflect the range of European statistics, broad correspondence with the IMF methodology has been ensured, so that countries which have recently conducted the survey in the framework of an IMF Data ROSC will not have to repeat it for the purposes of the peer review process. Accordingly, NSI conducting the survey in the framework of the peer reviews may wish to use the results in view of a future invitation to the IMF to conduct a Data ROSC.

2. Target population

In order to keep the survey manageable and modest in terms of investment needed by the National Statistical Institute, the target population ideally comprises known users from the

[4] For more information please refer to: www.imf.org

academic and research community, banks and business, government agencies, the national Parliaments, the media, the international community and other relevant user groups, specific to the selected statistical domains. The NSI is of course free to adjust the sample size according to their own needs and also to extend it to other users than those mentioned above. NSIs will be required to present results.

3. Methodology

In line with the IMF model the questionnaire comprises two parts. The first part aims at identifying the users' area of interest and the use of statistics and a second part focuses on the statistics' quality. Both parts include aspects of how the statistics are delivered. The list of statistical areas covered in this questionnaire is based on the IMF list but has been adapted to cover major European Statistics. NSIs are free to add central national products as far as considered useful. Users should be given about 2-3 weeks to reply with one reminder to be sent, if necessary.

National Statistical Institutes (NSIs) are requested to modify the questionnaire according to their needs in terms of language, format, and data carrier. If the NSI already carries out an own user satisfaction survey, this questionnaire is not meant to replace it. However, NSIs of course are free to incorporate it into their own survey as far as considered useful.

Questionnaires actually used by NSIs will be put on the Quality Circa site to inspire others.

3.1 Cover letter

Information provided by the NSI to the respondents of the survey should comprise:

- A general explanation that the results of this survey will be used to prepare a review of some features of the national statistical system by peers in the framework of the implementation of the Code of Practice
- Information and a reference (copy or link) to the European Statistics Code of Practice
- Structure of the questionnaire
- Assurance that names of individuals will not appear anywhere
- Deadline for reply
- Optional – a short glossary of quality terms if considered useful

4. References

Goddard E (2001). Public Confidence in Official Statistics. Office for national Statistics (unpublished).

Simmons E, Betts P (2006). Developing a Quantitative Measure of Public Confidence in Official Statistics

Sorrell M (2005). International Awareness: Public Confidence in Official Statistics. Office for National Statistics

Questionnaire on the use of official statistics

Section A: General Information about Uses of Official Statistics of *(Insert name of country)*

1. Which official statistics do you use regularly?
(Please check off all relevant datasets)
1.1. National accounts ☐
1.2. Prices ☐
1.3. Public finance statistics ☐
1.4. Production ☐
1.5. Employment statistics ☐
1.6. Foreign trade statistics ☐
1.7. Income and poverty statistics ☐
1.8. Environment statistics ☐
1.9. Other *(Please specify)* ☐

____

2. Where do you obtain the national official statistics:
(Please check off all relevant sources)
2.1 Official press releases by *(Insert name of NSI)* ☐
2.2 Official publications/website of *(Insert name of NSI)* ☐
2.3 On request from the *(Insert name of NSI)* ☐
2.4 Private sector summaries and analyses ☐
2.5 Publications/websites from European Institutions (e.g. Eurostat) ☐
2.6 Publications/websites from international organizations (e.g. OECD, IMF, UN) ☐
2.7 Other sources (*Please specify)* ☐

____

3. Do you refer to official descriptions provided by the NSI of the sources and methods that were used to compile the official statistics?
Yes ☐ No ☐
(Please comment) ____

4.1 For what purposes do you use the official statistics?
(Please check off all relevant uses)
4.1.1 Analysis of current developments for short-term decision making ☐
4.1.2 Analysis of trends for longer-term policy formulation ☐
4.1.3 Econometric model building and forecasting ☐
4.1.4 Research purposes ☐
4.1.5 General political background ☐
4.1.6 Re-dissemination of statistical data ☐
4.1.7 Other *(Please specify)* ☐

____

4.2 Which of the following statistics do you use to compare them with developments in other countries?
(Please check off all relevant uses)
4.2.1. National accounts ☐
4.2.2. Prices ☐
4.2.3. Public finance statistics ☐
4.2.4. Production ☐
4.2.5. Employment statistics ☐
4.2.6. Foreign trade statistics ☐
4.2.7. Income and poverty statistics ☐

4.2.8. Environment statistics ☐
4.2.9. Other *(Please specify)* ☐

____

4.2.10. None ☐

Section B: Information concerning Quality Aspects of the Official Statistics

5. Data accuracy

5.1 In your opinion, is the underlying methodology of official statistics sound and appropriate?

5.1.1. National accounts **Yes ☐ No ☐ *if no, please comment:*_______________ No opinion ☐**
5.1.2. Prices **Yes ☐ No ☐ *if no, please comment:*_______________ No opinion ☐**
5.1.3. Public finance statistics **Yes ☐ No ☐ *if no, please comment:*_______________ No opinion ☐**
5.1.4. Production **Yes ☐ No ☐ *if no, please comment:*_______________ No opinion ☐**
5.1.5. Employment statistics **Yes ☐ No ☐ *if no, please comment:*_______________ No opinion ☐**
5.1.6. Foreign trade statistics **Yes ☐ No ☐ *if no, please comment:*_______________ No opinion ☐**
5.1.7. Income and poverty statistics **Yes ☐ No ☐ *if no, please comment:*_______________ No opinion ☐**
5.1.8. Environment statistics **Yes ☐ No ☐ *if no, please comment:*_______________ No opinion ☐**
5.1.9. Other *(Please specify)*____
Yes ☐ No ☐ *if no, please comment:*_______________ No opinion ☐

5.2 In general, do you consider the official statistics to be sufficiently unbiased and accurate for your purposes?

5.2.1. National accounts **Yes ☐ No ☐ *if no, please comment:*______________ No opinion ☐**
5.2.2. Prices **Yes ☐ No ☐ *if no, please comment:*______________ No opinion ☐**
5.2.3. Public finance statistics **Yes ☐ No ☐ *if no, please comment:*______________ No opinion ☐**
5.2.4. Production **Yes ☐ No ☐ *if no, please comment:*______________ No opinion ☐**
5.2.5. Employment statistics **Yes ☐ No ☐ *if no, please comment:*______________ No opinion ☐**
5.2.6. Foreign trade statistics **Yes ☐ No ☐ *if no, please comment:*______________ No opinion ☐**
5.2.7. Income and poverty statistics **Yes ☐ No ☐ *if no, please comment:*______________ No opinion ☐**
5.2.8. Environment statistics **Yes ☐ No ☐ *if no, please comment:*______________ No opinion ☐**
5.2.9. Other *(Please specify)*________ **Yes ☐ No ☐ *if no, please comment:*______________ No opinion ☐**

6. Timeliness

6.1 In general, do you consider that the official statistics are disseminated sufficiently in time for your purposes?

6.1.1. National accounts **Yes ☐ No ☐ *if no, please comment:*______________ No opinion ☐**
6.1.2. Prices **Yes ☐ No ☐ *if no, please comment:*______________ No opinion ☐**
6.1.3. Public finance statistics **Yes ☐ No ☐ *if no, please comment:*______________ No opinion ☐**
6.1.4. Production **Yes ☐ No ☐ *if no, please comment:*______________ No opinion ☐**
6.1.5. Employment statistics **Yes ☐ No ☐ *if no, please comment:*______________ No opinion ☐**
6.1.6. Foreign trade statistics **Yes ☐ No ☐ *if no, please comment:*______________ No opinion ☐**
6.1.7. Income and poverty statistics **Yes ☐ No ☐ *if no, please comment:*______________ No opinion ☐**
6.1.8. Environment statistics **Yes ☐ No ☐ *if no, please comment:*______________ No opinion ☐**
6.1.9. Other *(Please specify)*________ **Yes ☐ No ☐ *if no, please comment:*______________ No opinion ☐**

7. Dissemination practices

7.1 Do you know that there is a publicly disseminated calendar that announces in advance the dates on which many of the various official statistics will be disseminated?
Yes ☐
No ☐

7.2 In your experience, are the official statistics released on the dates announced?
Yes ☐
No ☐
No experience ☐

7.3 Is there enough information about revisions to official statistics to satisfy your needs?
Yes ☐
No ☐
Not relevant ☐

7.4.1 Can you easily access official statistics?
Yes ☐ **No** ☐ **if no, please comment:**____

7.4.2 When consulting the website of *(Insert name of NS)I* **do you find it easy to access statistical data?**
Yes ☐ **No** ☐ **if no, please comment:**____
No opinion ☐

7.5 Are official statistics presented in an easy-to-understand way?
Yes ☐ **No** ☐ **if no, please comment:**____
No opinion ☐

7.6 Can you easily access information pertaining to official statistics you use (explanatory notes, methodological descriptions, references concerning concepts, classifications, statistical practice)?
Yes ☐ **No** ☐ **if no, please comment:**____
No opinion ☐

7.7 Is the above information on methodology sufficiently clear and at an adequate level of detail to be useful to you?
Yes ☐ **No** ☐ **if no, please comment:**____
No opinion ☐

8. Overall assessment

8.1 How would you consider the quality of official statistics of the country compared with those of other European countries ?

Better ☐ **Same** ☐ **Worse** ☐ **No opinion** ☐

Please give a short explanation for your choice:

____
____
____

8.2 How do you assess the overall quality of the official statistics in *(please insert country name)*
(from 1= very low to 5= very high)

	--	-	0	+	++	
8.2.1. National accounts	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4☐	5☐	no opinion ☐
8.2.2. Prices	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4☐	5☐	no opinion ☐
8.2.3. Public finance statistics	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4☐	5☐	no opinion ☐
8.2.4. Production statistics	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4☐	5☐	no opinion ☐
8.2.5. Employment statistics	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4☐	5☐	no opinion ☐

8.2.6. Foreign trade statistics	**1 ☐**	**2 ☐**	**3 ☐**	**4☐**	**5☐**	**no opinion ☐**
8.2.7. Income and poverty statistics	**1 ☐**	**2 ☐**	**3 ☐**	**4☐**	**5☐**	**no opinion ☐**
8.2.8. Environment statistics	**1 ☐**	**2 ☐**	**3 ☐**	**4☐**	**5☐**	**no opinion ☐**
8.2.9. Other *(Please specify)*_________	**1 ☐**	**2 ☐**	**3 ☐**	**4☐**	**5☐**	**no opinion ☐**

8.3. Additional comments, including on areas where you see room for improvement
(*Please specify the dataset(s) to which your comments refer)*

____
____
____
____

Please give the name of your institution (voluntary):_______________________________
Thank you for your assistance in completing this questionnaire.

Annex IV: Description of the National Statistical System

[Logo of NSI]

Statistical Office of XXX
Brief description

I. GENERAL INFORMATION:
- Mission of the NSI;
- Status of the NSI in public administration system of the country;
- Procedure of appointment of Director-General of the NSI;
- Location of seat of the NSI, regional offices;
- Organisational structure of the NSI;
- Main legal act(s);
- Statistical programme(s).

II. SYSTEM OF OFFICIAL STATISTICS IN THE COUNTRY
- The role of the NSI in the system, other major players.

III. ADVISORY BODY/STATISTICAL COUNCIL (or its equivalent)
- Composition, main tasks.

IV. PUBLICATIONS

V. OTHER RELEVANT REMARKS (e.g. major policies)

For more information:

Website of the NSI (hyperlinked)