



REGIONAL DIMENSION OF POVERTY AND SOCIAL EXCLUSION INDICATORS

Georgiana Ivan
EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DG EUROSTAT

21 February 2013

Meeting of providers of OECD income distribution data

1



Current situation -SILC

- Instrument for measuring poverty and living conditions at national level (regulation)
- But: growing user demands for regional poverty data (with a focus on NUTS 2 level)
- What to do?
- Regional data from fieldwork (but quality requirements) and modelling techniques

21 February 2013

Meeting of providers of OECD income
distribution data

2



Current situation – availability of regional poverty data

Data available at regional level (number of MS)

	Published	Estimated (only AROP)	Not concerned (only 1 region)	Missing
NUTS 1	12	4	10	1
NUTS 2	12	5	6	4

- The only one MS missing at NUTS 1 does provide estimates for NUTS 2 level

21 February 2013

Meeting of providers of OECD income distribution data

3



Current situation – availability of regional poverty data

- The 3 largest MS use another main source for collecting income information
- One of them will move the data collection towards another survey with a larger sample size
- Another one will do in-house modelling (calibration)

21 February 2013

Meeting of providers of OECD income distribution data

4





Current situation – quality of regional measures

Absolute difference (point estimate - confidence interval bond) (percentage of regions in this situation, out of the total analysed, 21/20 MS)

	AROPE	AROP	SMD	LWI
< 3	18.1%	26.4%	62.1%	45.2%
3-5	34.3%	36.4%	26.6%	27.4%
>5	47.6%	37.2%	11.3%	27.4%

21 February 2013

Meeting of providers of OECD income distribution data

5



Current situation – quality of regional measures

Relative difference (absolute difference/ point estimate) (percentage of regions in this situation, out of the total analysed, 21/20 MS)

	AROPE	AROP	SMD	LWI
≤ 0.25	58.1%	43.3%	16.1%	19.0%
> 0.25	41.9%	56.7%	83.1%	81.0%

21 February 2013

Meeting of providers of OECD income distribution data

6



Current situation – quality of regional measures

Percentage of regions where a significant difference from national average can be identified, out of the total number analysed (20/ 19 MS)

	AROEPE	AROP	SMD	LWI
Yes	30.1%	30.5%	28.8%	24.3%
No (gray zone)	69.9%	69.5%	71.2%	75.7%

Conclusion: in many cases confidence intervals are large and this causes overlaps

21 February 2013

Meeting of providers of OECD income distribution data

7



Conclusions

- Careful choice of the poverty indicator
- Ranking and even categorization of regions not easy
- The regional dimension is important in some countries, in others not
- Need for validation from national experts (gray zones)
- Aim: data collection for NUTS 2 level (some countries NUTS 1, or 1.5), modelling for lower levels

21 February 2013

Meeting of providers of OECD income distribution data

8



Questions?

You can address them now or later at:

Aurelia-Georgiana.IVAN@ec.europa.eu

21 February 2013

Meeting of providers of OECD income
distribution data

9