



# ESS Peer Reviews: an efficient means to implement the European Statistics Code of Practice?

Q2016 Conference  
Madrid 31.5-3.6.2016  
Kirsi Karkkainen

## Why peer reviews?

- Peer reviews 2006 – 2008  
(Principles 1 – 6 + 15)
  - 2008 Report to EP and Council: another peer review within five years
  - Sponsorship on Quality 2009 – 2011:
    - Revised CoP September 2011
    - Quality Assurance Framework
  - 2012 ECA Special Report No 12
- 2012 ESSC recommendations for a new round of peer reviews**



# Why?

- Compliance with CoP largely achieved



- Objectives:
  - internal:
    - remaining challenges to CoP compliance
    - enhance CoP implementation
  - external:
    - strengthen trust in the ESS and European statistics

## What and who?

- European statistics
  - Code of Practice – all 15 principles
  - Coordination of national statistical systems
  - Cooperation & level of integration within the ESS
  - Innovative practices
- 
- EU + EFTA  
pilots in Slovakia and Iceland in 2013
  - NSIs + selected ONAs
  - Eurostat – by ESGAB



## What with?

- **Audit-like approach:**
  - **more standardised** procedures and reports
  - **issues**
  - **evidence**
  - peer reviewers **owners** of the reports
- **Outsourcing:**
  - organisation outsourced
  - **independent, external** peer reviewers
- **Tools:**
  - **self-assessment questionnaires, guides**
  - peer review **visits**

## Did it work 1?

- **Objectives:**

- internal: **largely met**

- external: **pending**

- intended beneficiaries should be clear from the outset

- legacy or forward-looking exercise

- **Scope:**

- **too ambitious** for time and resources available

- ONA involvement: **yes and no**

- innovative practices: **wrong medium**

- in-depth reflection on objectives, realistic assessment of needs and available resources

## Did it work 2?

- **Audit-like approach:**
  - **yes** – but would have benefited from a more structured framework
    - a more rigorous approach with predefined assessment criteria
- **Outsourcing:**
  - **yes:** increased objectivity, **but** perceived **trade-off** in thorough knowledge of how NSIs and the ESS work
    - reviewer profile dependent on the nature of the exercise (legacy or other)
- **Self-assessment questionnaires:**
  - **yes:** internal reflection
  - **no:** long and unwieldy for external assessing
    - any future SAQ better fit for purpose

## Efficient means to implement the CoP?

- Yes:
  - instigated internal reflection and improvement
  - audit-like method increased objectivity and accountability
  - exercise conducted efficiently and on schedule...but also some elements that worked less well...

→ Key questions for any future action:

- Beneficiaries
- Objective
- Scope
- Resources



## Where to go...

if you want to find out more:

<http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/quality/peer-reviews>

# Thank you for your attention