SILC_ESQRS_A_RO_2016_0000
National Reference Metadata in ESS Standard for Quality Reports Structure (ESQRSSI)
Compiling agency: National Institute of Statistics

Eurostat metadata
Reference metadata

For any question on data and metadata, please contact: Eurostat user support

1. Contact   Top

1.1. Contact organisation	National Institute of Statistics
1.2. Contact organisation unit	Social Statistics
1.5. Contact mail address	-

2. Statistical presentation   Top

2.1. Data description

Not available.
New concept added with the migration to SIMS 2.0.
Information (content) will be available after the next collection.

2.2. Classification system

Not available.
New concept added with the migration to SIMS 2.0.
Information (content) will be available after the next collection.

2.3. Coverage - sector

Not available.
New concept added with the migration to SIMS 2.0.
Information (content) will be available after the next collection.

2.4. Statistical concepts and definitions

Total hh gross income (HY010)	Total disposable hh income (HY020)	Total disposable hh income before social transfers other than old-age and survivors' benefits (HY022)	Total disposable hh income before all social transfers (HY023)
F	F	F	F

Imputed rent (HY030)	Income from rental of property or land (HY040)	Family/ Children related allowances (HY050)	Social exclusion payments not elsewhere classified (HY060)	Housing allowances (HY070)	Regular inter-hh cash transfers received (HY080)	Interest, dividends, profit from capital investments in incorporated businesses (HY090)	Interest paid on mortgage (HY100)	Income received by people aged under 16 (HY110)	Regular taxes on wealth (HY120)	Regular inter-hh transfers paid (HY130)
F	F	F	F	NC	F	F	F	F	F	F

Cash or near-cash employee income (PY010)	Other non-cash employee income (PY020)	Income from private use of company car (PY021)	Employers social insurance contributions (PY030)	Cash profits or losses from self-employment (PY050)	Value of goods produced for own consumption (PY070)	Unemployment benefits (PY090)	Old-age benefits (PY100)	Survivors benefits (PY110)	Sickness benefits (PY120)	Disability benefits (PY130)	Education-related allowances (PY140)	Gross monthly earnings for employees (PY200)
F	F	F	NC	F	NC	F	L	F	F	F	F	NC
The source or procedure used for the collection of income variables	The form in which income variables at component level have been obtained						The method used for obtaining target variables in the required form					
The source for the collection of income variables was paper and pencil interviews for all income variables, including the money drawn out of business by the self-employed. We did not used administrative records. The use of the justificative documents regarding the incomes was the respondents' decision.	The majority of income components were recorded net and the gross variables were obtained by adding at the net values, the value of income tax retained at source and social contributions paid (in the case of wages, we add the value of other sums retained at source, too).						The only income components calculated in the process of data editing were: - the value of income tax retained at source for salaries (we have a flat rate of 16% for income tax), the respondents being asked only if they paid or not the income tax for wage; - the exact value of the social insurance contribution retained at source for salaries, if this was declared in the form of an interval. - the value of income tax retained at source and social insurance contributions for pensions (if the pension was bigger than 1000 lei); - the interest for dividends and money withdrawn from the banks.					

2.5. Statistical unit

Not available.
New concept added with the migration to SIMS 2.0.
Information (content) will be available after the next collection.

2.6. Statistical population

Not available.
New concept added with the migration to SIMS 2.0.
Information (content) will be available after the next collection.

2.7. Reference area

Not available.
New concept added with the migration to SIMS 2.0.
Information (content) will be available after the next collection.

2.8. Coverage - Time

Not available.
New concept added with the migration to SIMS 2.0.
Information (content) will be available after the next collection.

2.9. Base period

Not available.
New concept added with the migration to SIMS 2.0.
Information (content) will be available after the next collection.

3. Statistical processing

Detailed information concerning sampling frame, sampling design, sampling units, sampling size, weightings and mode of data collection can be found in this section. Such information is mainly used for the computation of the accuracy measures.

3.1. Source data

Starting with 2015, the household surveys carried out by NSI-Romania are based on the use of Multifunctional Sample of Territorial Areas, so called the master sample new EMZOT. It is a database including approximately 1.500.000 dwellings, selected according to probabilistic criteria, serving as sampling frame for all household surveys, in 2015-2024.

For the wave 1 and wave 2 (subsample selected in 2015 and 2016), a master sample database named "new EMZOT" is used. In the first stage, a stratified random sample of 792 areas, Primary Sampling Units (PSUs), was designed after the 2011 Population and Dwelling Census. The PSUs were sampled with probability proportional to the size (number of permanent dwellings). The new EMZOT sample has 450 PSUs selected from urban area and 342 PSUs selected from rural area. In the second stage, a fix number of dwellings are systematically selected from each PSU of EMZOT.

For the others two waves, a master sample database named "old EMZOT" was used. In the first stage, a stratified random sample of 780 areas, Primary Sampling Units (PSUs), was designed after the 2002 Census. The PSUs were sampled with probability proportional to the size (number of permanent dwellings). The

EMZOT sample has 427 PSUs selected from urban area and 353 PSUs selected from rural area. In the second stage, a fix number of dwellings are systematically selected from each PSU of EMZOT.

3.1.1. Sampling

Type of sampling design

The sampling plan is a two-stage probability sampling of housing units (dwellings).

Stratification and sub stratification criteria

Stratification concerns only the first stage sampling. There are 88 strata, the criteria used being the area where a certain PSU is located (urban or rural area) and county (NUTS 3 level).

Sample selection schemes

The survey uses the integrated four years rotational panel design, in which one-fourth of the sample is replaced each year. The total sample for the year 2016 is made by the sub-samples S2, S3, S4 and S1.

ub-samples

	Years									
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
	S1									
	S2	S2								
	S3	S3	S3							
	S4	S4	S4	S4						
		S1	S1	S1	S1					
			S2	S2	S2	S2				
			S3	S3	S3	S3	S3			
				S4	S4	S4	S4	S4		
					S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	
						S2	S2	S2	S2	S2
							S3	S3	S3	S3
								S4	S4	S4
									S1	S1

Sample distribution over time

The sample is not distributed over time.

3.1.2. Sampling unit

The Primary Sampling Unit, corresponding to the selection of the *master sample*, is a group of Census sections (census enumeration areas EAs).
The Secondary (ultimate) Sampling Unit, corresponding to the selection of the survey sample, is the dwelling.

3.1.3. Sampling frame

Concerning the SILC instrument, three different sample size definitions can be applied:
- the actual sample size which is the number of sampling units selected in the sample
- the achieved sample size which is the number of observed sampling units (household or individual) with an accepted interview
- the effective sample size which is defined as the achieved sample size divided by the design effect with regards to the at-risk-of poverty rate indicator
Given that the effective sample size has been already treated in the section dealing with sampling errors, in this section the attention focuses mainly on the achieved sample size.

Actual and achieved sample size

Obs	Actual S_Size	Achieved_S
1	8010	7406

Achieved sample size

Obs	number_of_hh 2015	number_of_hh 2016	percent1	persons_16_ over_2016	last_rot_ group	num_of_ rot__hh_2016	percent2
1	7510	7406	98.6	15795	1	2170	29.30

QFR

Achieved sample size

• **Number of households for which an interview is accepted for the database by rotational group**

Wave 1 - year 2013

ROTATIONAL GROUP	households	percentage
DB075=2	1918	100.0
Total	**1918**	**100.0**

Wave 2 - year 2014

ROTATIONAL GROUP	households	percentage
DB075=2	1916	50.2
DB075=3	1902	49.8
Total	**3818**	**100.0**

Wave 3 - year 2015

ROTATIONAL GROUP	households	percentage
DB075=2	1896	33.2
DB075=3	1902	33.2
DB075=4	1919	33.6
Total	**5717**	**100.0**

Wave 4 - year 2016

ROTATIONAL GROUP	households	percentage
DB075=2	1853	23.1
DB075=3	1850	23.1
DB075=4	1919	24.0
DB075=1	2388	29.8
Total	**8010**	**100.0**

• **Number of persons 16 years or older. number of sample persons and number of co-residents who are members of the households for which the interview is accepted for the database and who completed the personal interview**

Wave 1 - 2013	Number
Number of persons 16 years and older, from which:	**3920**
- sample persons	3920
- co-residents	-
Wave 2 - 2014	**7859**
- sample persons	7836
- co-residents	23
Wave 3 - 2014	**11925**
- sample persons	11874
- co-residents	50
Wave 4 - 2015	**11998**
- sample persons	11798
- co-residents	199

3.2. Frequency of data collection
Frequency of data collection is annually.
3.3. Data collection

Data collection period was 9 – 25 May 2016.

Mode of data collection

The method of data collection was face-to-face personal interviews, using paper questionnaires. The interviewers visited the addresses selected in the sample and fulfilled the questionnaires, based on the interviews. The household questionnaire was fulfilled by interview with the household head and individual questionnaire by interview with each household member 16 years old and more.

Distribution of households members 16 years old and over by data status

	Number	%
Total	**15835**	**100.0**
Information of interview completed	**15795**	**99.75**
- information completed only from interview (RB250=11)	15795	99.75

-information completed only from registers (RB250=12)	na	na
-information completed both from interview and registers (RB250=13)	na	na
Interview not completed, though contact made	**24**	**0.15**
-individual unable to answer and no proxy possible (RB250=21)		
-failed to return the self-administrated questionnaire (RB250=22)	na	na
-refusal to cooperate (RB250=23)	24	0.15
Individual not contacted because:	**16**	**0.10**
-person temporarily away and no proxy possible (RB250=31)	15	0.09
-no contact for other reasons **(RB250=32)**	1	0.01
Information not completed, reason unknown (RB250=33)	-	-

Distribution of household members by the respondent status

	Number	%
Total	**17414**	**100.0**
- Current household member aged 16 years and over (RB245=1)	15835	90.93
0- Selected respondent (RB245=2)	na	na
- non-selected respondent (RB245=3)	na	na
- not eligible respondent (RB245=4)	1579	9.07

3 Distribution of households members aged 16 years old and over by the type of interview

	Number	%
Total	**15795**	**100.0**
Questionnaire completed –face-to-face interview PAPI (RB260=1)	14158	89.64
Questionnaire completed –face-to-face interview CAPI (RB260=2)	na	na
Questionnaire completed –CATI (RB260=3)	na	na
Self-administrated by respondent (RB260=4)	na	na
Proxy interview (RB260=6)	1637	10.36

Obs	RB010	proxy	total	proxy_rate
1	2016	1637	15795	10.36

A description of the mode of data collection used in your country. Please mention if you use mixed mode of data collection.

1-PAPI	2-CAPI	3-CATI	4-Self administrated
(% of total)	(% of total)	(% of total)	(% of total)
100.0	-	-	-

The mean interview duration

The mean interview duration per household is calculated as the sum of the duration of all household interviews plus the sum of the duration of all personal interviews, divided by the number of household questionnaires completed. Only households accepted for the database have to be considered.

Average interview duration = 30.5 minutes.

Obs	duration_16	duration_15	duration_14	duration_13
1	30.5	30.7	30.4	30.1

QFR

Distribution of households members aged 16 years old and over by data status (RB250)

	Number	%
	Number	%
Wave 1 – year 2013		
Total	**4441**	**100.0**
Information of interview completed	**3920**	**88.3**
- information completed only from interview (RB250=11)	3920	88.3
- information completed only from registers (RB250=12)	na	na
- information completed both from interview and registers (RB250=13)	na	na

Interview not completed, though contact made	**520**	**11.7**
- individual unable to answer and no proxy possible (RB250=21)	-	-
- failed to return the self-administrated questionnaire (RB250=22)	na	na
- refusal to cooperate (RB250=23)	19	0.43
- not eligible person (RB245=4 i.e RB250_F= -2)	501	11.28
Individual not contacted because:	**1**	**0.02**
- person temporarily away and no proxy possible (RB250=31)	1	0.02
- no contact for other reasons (RB250=32)	0	0.0
Information not completed, reason unknow (RB250=33)	-	-
Wave 2 – year 2014		
Total	**8773**	**100.0**
Information of interview completed	**7859**	**89.58**
- information completed only from interview (RB250=11)	7859	89.58
- information completed only from registers (RB250=12)	na	na
- information completed both from interview and registers (RB250=13)	na	na
Interview not completed, though contact made	**902**	**10.28**
- individual unable to answer and no proxy possible (RB250=21)	-	-
- failed to return the self-administrated questionnaire (RB250=22)	na	na
- refusal to cooperate (RB250=23)	14	0.16
- not eligible person (RB245=4 i.e RB250_F= -2)	888	10.12
Individual not contacted because:	**12**	**0.14**
- person temporarily away and no proxy possible (RB250=31)	6	0.07
- no contact for other reasons (RB250=32)	6	0.07
Information not completed, reason unknow (RB250=33)	-	-
Wave 3 – year 2015		
Total	**13285**	**100.0**
Information of interview completed	**11925**	**89.76**
- information completed only from interview (RB250=11)	11925	89.76
- information completed only from registers (RB250=12)	na	na
- information completed both from interview and	na	na

	Number	%
registers (RB250=13)		
Interview not completed, though contact made	**1351**	**10.17**
- individual unable to answer and no proxy possible (RB250=21)	-	-
- failed to return the self-administrated questionnaire (RB250=22)	na	na
- refusal to cooperate (RB250=23)	18	0.14
- not eligible person (RB245=4 i.e RB250_F= -2)	1333	10.03
Individual not contacted because:	**9**	**0.07**
- person temporarily away and no proxy possible (RB250=31)	4	0.035
- no contact for other reasons (RB250=32)	4	0.035
Information not completed, reason unknow (RB250=33)	1	0
Wave 4 – year 2016		
Total	**17522**	**100.0**
Information of interview completed	**15795**	**90.14**
- information completed only from interview (RB250=11)	15795	90.14
- information completed only from registers (RB250=12)	na	na
- information completed both from interview and registers (RB250=13)	na	na
Interview not completed, though contact made	**1603**	**9.15**
- individual unable to answer and no proxy possible (RB250=21)	-	-
- failed to return the self-administrated questionnaire (RB250=22)	na	na
- refusal to cooperate (RB250=23)	24	0.14
- not eligible person (RB245=4 i.e RB250_F= -2)	1579	9.01
Individual not contacted because:	**124**	**0.71**
- person temporarily away and no proxy possible (RB250=31)	123	0.71
- no contact for other reasons (RB250=32)	1	0
Information not completed, reason unknow (RB250=33)	-	-

Distribution of households members aged 16 years old and over by the respondent status

	Number	%
Wave 1 – year 2013		
Total	**4441**	**100.0**
- Current household member aged 16 years and over (RB245=1)	3940	88.72
- Selected respondent (RB245=2)	na	na
- non-selected respondent (RB245=3)	na	na
- not eligible respondent (RB245=4)	501	11.28

	Number	%
Wave 2 – year 2014		
Total	**8773**	**100.0**
- Current household member aged 16 years and over (RB245=1)	7880	89.82
- Selected respondent (RB245=2)	na	na
- non-selected respondent (RB245=3)	na	na
- non-selected respondent (RB245=4)	888	10.12
- not existent respondent in current wave (RB245_F=-2 and RB250_F=-2)	5	0.06
Wave 3 – year 2015		
Total	**13285**	**100.0**
- Current household member aged 16 years and over (RB245=1)	11851	89.96
- Selected respondent (RB245=2)	na	na
- non-selected respondent (RB245=3)	na	na
- non-selected respondent (RB245=4)	1333	10.03
- not existent respondent in current wave (RB245_F=-2 and RB250_F=-2)	1	0.01
Wave 4 – year 2016		
Total	**17522**	**100.0**
- Current household member aged 16 years and over (RB245=1)	15835	90.37
- Selected respondent (RB245=2)	na	na
- non-selected respondent (RB245=3)	na	na
- non-selected respondent (RB245=4)	1579	9.01
- not existent respondent in current wave (RB245_F=-2 and RB250_F=-2)	108	0.62

Distribution of households members aged 16 years old and over by the type of interview

	Number	%
Wave 1 – year 2013		
Total	**4441**	**100.0**
- Questionnaire completed –face-to-face interview PAPI (RB260=1)	3397	76.49
- Questionnaire completed –face-to-face interview CAPI (RB260=2)	na	na
- Questionnaire completed –CATI (RB260=3)	na	na
- Self-administrated by respondent (RB260=4)	na	na
- Proxy interview (RB260=5)	523	11.78
Not applicable (RB250 # 11, 13)	521	11.73
Wave 2 – year 2014		
Total	**8773**	**100.0**

- Questionnaire completed –face-to-face interview PAPI (RB260=1)	6722	76.62
- Questionnaire completed –face-to-face interview CAPI (RB260=2)	na	na
- Questionnaire completed –CATI (RB260=3)	na	na
- Self-administrated by respondent (RB260=4)	na	na
- Proxy interview (RB260=6)	1137	12.96
Not applicable (RB250 # 11, 13)	914	10.42
Wave 3 – year 2014		
Total	**13285**	**100.0**
- Questionnaire completed –face-to-face interview PAPI (RB260=1)	10634	80.04
- Questionnaire completed –face-to-face interview CAPI (RB260=2)	na	na
- Questionnaire completed –CATI (RB260=3)	na	na
- Self-administrated by respondent (RB260=4)	na	na
- Proxy interview (RB260=5)	1291	9.72
Not applicable (RB250 # 11, 13)	1360	10.24
Wave 4 – year 2015		
Total	**17522**	**100.0**
- Questionnaire completed –face-to-face interview PAPI (RB260=1)	14158	80.80
- Questionnaire completed –face-to-face interview CAPI (RB260=2)	na	na
- Questionnaire completed –CATI (RB260=3)	na	na
- Self-administrated by respondent (RB260=4)	na	na
- Proxy interview (RB260=5)	1637	9.34
Not applicable (RB250 # 11, 13)	1727	9.86

3.4. Data validation
-

3.5. Data compilation
-

3.5.1. Weighting procedure

Design factor	Non-response adjustments	Adjustment to external data	Final cross sectional weights
Wave 1(subsample selected in 2016) The design factor of the household is the inverse of inclusion probability. The design factor for households and for individuals are the same, because in each selected	In order to contra balance the non-respondent households, it is proceed at a re-weighting, by adjusting the weights of the respondent households with the inverse of the response rate. The non-response are not globally adjusted, at the entire sample level, but separately-at wave level, on groups of households, groups generated by the variables considered as explicative of the non response. This correspond to the so-called 'response-homogenous groups' method, which assumes that in a certain group all the units have the same probability. For wave 1 we used as explicative variables for non-response region (NUTS II level) and area of residence	We applied an integrative calibration that means that we used both households and personal variables in the procedure. The calibration is performed at the household level using the household variables and individual variables in their aggregate form as calibration variables. This technique ensures that all members in the same household receive the same weight. Adjustments were made using the SAS macro CALMAR. Calibration variables were: "distribution of the population by age group (0-15; 16-24;	Three cross-sectional weights were calculated: 1) Household cross-sectional

Design factor	Non-response adjustments	Adjustment to external data	Final cross sectional weights
dwelling, all persons are selected for the survey. In case of the households at the second, third and four wave, an indirect sampling of households is done through the panel (of persons aged 14+ at the time of the panel selection). In this case, the inclusion probabilities cannot be calculated. Then, the solution consists of applying the Weight Share Method. *Wave 2 (subsample selected in 2015)* The design factors of households are calculated through the individual base weights. The individual base weights are obtained from cross-sectional weights calculated in previous year inflated with attrition. *Wave 3 (subsample selected in 2014)* There are two situations: a. The sample person was a respondent in 2015. The base weight is calculated taking into account the base weight of previous year and then corrected both: attrition between 2015 and 2016 and compensation of the re-entrees. b. The sample person was a non-respondent in 2015 (re-entrees). In this case the base weight is obtain taking into account the cross-sectional weight RB050 calculated in 2014 corrected for the attrition between 2014-2016. *Wave 4 (subsample selected in 2013)* The approach is similar with the previous wave and two cases are distinguished, too: a. The sample person was a respondent in 2015. The base weight is calculated taking into account the base weight of previous year and then corrected both: attrition	(urban / rural) and for the second, third and fourth wave - the region. In order to minimize the effects induced by the presence of non-response another adjustment is done: re-weighting by calibration of the weights.	25-34; 35-44; 45-54; 55-64; 65 and over) and gender" using Romanian Residential Population Estimates at the end of the income reference period and "households totals" by region.	weight (DB090) 2) Personal cross-sectional weight for all household members (RB050) 3) Personal cross-sectional weight for all household members aged 16 and over (PB040)

Design factor	Non-response adjustments	Adjustment to external data	Final cross sectional weights
between 2015 and 2016 and compensation of the re-entrees. b. The sample person was a non-respondent in 2015. In this case the base weight is obtain taking into account the base weight calculated in 2014 corrected for the attrition between 2014-2016.			

3.5.2. Estimation and imputation

Imputation procedure used	Imputed rent		Company car
	The value of imputed rent was estimated at the household level (and included in the personal file for only one person per household) from the household budget survey (HBS), using the stratification method. The HBS includes arround 37000 households and it is conducted continuosly during each year.		The following information was collected in the individual questionnaire: -the type of the car; -the model; -the registration year; -number of months in 2015 the car was at the disposal of the person for private use; The company car value was calculated as: Company car value = number of months*selling price*[1 − 100* (2016 - registration year)/10]/12 The selling prices of the cars by type of car and producer were taken into account.

3.6. Adjustment

-

4. Quality management

4.1. Quality assurance

Not available.
New concept added with the migration to SIMS 2.0.
Information (content) will be available after the next collection.

4.2. Quality management - assessment

-

5. Relevance

5.1. Relevance - User Needs

-

5.2. Relevance - User Satisfaction

-

5.3. Completeness

-

5.3.1. Data completeness - rate

-

6. Accuracy and reliability

The concept of accuracy refers to the precision of estimates computed from a sample rather than from the entire population. Accuracy depends on sample size, sampling design effects and structure of the population under study. In addition to that, sampling errors and non sampling errors need to be taken into account. Sampling error refers to the variability that occurs at random because of the use of a sample rather than a census and non-sampling errors are errors that occur in all phases of the data collection and production process.

6.1. Accuracy - overall

In terms of precision requirements, the EU-SILC framework regulation as well the Commission Regulation on sampling and tracing rules refers respectively, to the effective sample size to be achieved and to representativeness of the sample. The effective sample size combines sample size and sampling design effect which depends on sampling design, population structure and non-response rate.

6.2. Sampling error

EU-SILC is a complex survey involving different sampling design in different countries. In order to harmonize and make sampling errors comparable among countries, Eurostat (with the substantial methodological support of Net-SILC2) has chosen to apply the "linearization" technique coupled with the "ultimate cluster" approach for variance estimation. Linearization is a technique based on the use of linear approximation to reduce non-linear statistics to a linear form, justified by asymptotic properties of the estimator. This technique can encompass a wide variety of indicators, including EU-SILC indicators. The "ultimate cluster" approach is a simplification consisting in calculating the variance taking into account only variation among Primary Sampling Unit (PSU) totals. This method requires first stage sampling fractions to be small which is nearly always the case. This method allows a great flexibility and simplifies the calculations of variances. It can also be generalized to calculate variance of the differences of one year to another.

The main hypothesis on which the calculations are based is that the "at risk of poverty" threshold is fixed. According to the characteristics and availability of data for different countries we have used different variables to specify strata and cluster information. In particular, countries have been split into four groups:

1)BE, BG, CZ, IE, EL, ES, FR, IT, LV, HU, NL, PL, PT, RO, SI, UK and HR whose sampling design could be assimilated to a two stage stratified type we used DB050 (primary strata) for strata specification and DB060 (Primary Sampling Unit) for cluster specification;

2) DE, EE, CY, LT, LU, AT, SK, FI, CH whose sampling design could be assimilated to a one stage stratified type we used DB050 for strata specification and DB030 (household ID) for cluster specification;

3) DK, MT, SE, IS, NO, whose sampling design could be assimilated to a simple random sampling, we used DB030 for cluster specification and no strata;

Sampling errors were calculated for the common cross-sectional EU indicators based on the cross-sectional component of EU-SILC. Particularly, sampling errors were estimated with the JRR method using the software developed by Siena University (EUSILC-Report 06 for the Intermediary Quality).

QIR

Nr crt	Subpopulation	est	stat_se	kish	n
1	HCR	0.26	0.03	1.40	17355
2	HCR, after social transfers: Male	0.25	0.03	1.40	8295
3	HCR, after social transfers: Female	0.26	0.03	1.41	9060
4	HCR, before social transfers including pensions	0.30	0.03	1.40	17355
5	HCR, before social transfers excluding pensions	0.49	0.05	1.33	17355
6	At-risk-of-poverty threshold	6519.60	703.06	1.33	17355
7	S80/S20	7.25	0.85	1.46	17355
8	Gini coefficient	0.35	0.04	1.54	17355

QFR

Nr_crt	est	stat_se	n	kish	Measure
1	27042.81	10151.96	7406	1.55	mean HY010
2	21490.27	8065.40	7388	1.51	mean HY020
3	20275.10	7610.43	7406	1.50	mean HY022
4	14242.65	5350.66	7406	1.49	mean HY023
5	8439.40	7346.89	3	1.04	mean HY040g
6	2065.37	797.00	1416	1.82	mean HY050g
7	1334.76	530.44	349	1.40	mean HY060g
8	2137.33	831.17	157	1.04	mean HY080g
9	1775.17	1068.61	83	0.93	mean HY090g
10	265.74	125.69	36	1.85	mean HY100g
11	3236.76	1226.27	860	1.26	mean HY110g
12	245.87	92.35	6765	1.51	mean HY120g
13	1631.73	675.69	40	1.22	mean HY130g
14	8731.96	3279.71	4319	1.63	mean HY140g
15	10193.90	3825.99	2237	1.20	mean eqinc hhs=1
16	13752.07	5167.86	2491	1.46	mean eqinc hhs=2

17	14406.69	5409.77	1275	1.34	mean eqinc hhs=3
18	11457.06	4311.41	1385	1.52	mean eqinc hhs=4
19	12199.38	4578.15	7388	1.46	mean eqinc all hhs
20	20068.78	7530.19	5144	1.30	mean PY010g
21	4331.04	3333.49	9	1.19	mean PY090g
22	10983.85	4121.15	5202	1.21	mean PY100g
23	3236.76	1226.27	860	1.26	mean PY110g
24	1234.56	658.71	5	1.17	mean PY120g
25	7148.68	2693.10	487	1.28	mean PY130g
26	2660.73	1516.20	22	1.20	mean PY140g
27	10158.35	3820.95	3203	1.30	mean eqinc class age 1
28	13422.77	5048.29	1709	1.25	mean eqinc class age 2
29	11976.57	4500.81	2510	1.24	mean eqinc class age 3
30	12577.09	4725.82	2674	1.22	mean eqinc class age 4
31	12989.19	4878.93	2894	1.21	mean eqinc class age 5
32	11765.06	4413.87	4502	1.21	mean eqinc class age 6
33	12062.11	4529.22	8367	1.34	mean eqinc RB090=1
34	11695.45	4391.09	9125	1.32	mean eqinc RB090=2
35	11874.45	4458.14	17492	1.33	mean eqinc all R

6.2.1. Sampling error - indicators

	AROPE			At risk of poverty (60%)			Severe Material Deprivation			Very low work intensity		
	Ind. value	Stand. errors	Half CI (95%)	Ind. value	Stand. errors	Half CI (95%)	Ind. value	Stand. errors	Half CI (95%)	Ind. value	Stand. errors	Half CI (95%)
Total	38.8	1.2	±2.4	25.3	1.1	±2.2	23.8	1.1	±2.2	8.2	0.9	±1.8
Male	37.8	1.3	±2.5	24.8	1.2	±2.4	23.8	1.2	±2.4	7.2	0.9	±1.8
Female	39.8	1.2	±2.4	25.7	1.2	±2.4	23.7	1.2	±2.4	9.2	0.9	±1.8
Age0-17	49.2	2.4	±4.7	37.2	2.6	±5.1	30.2	2.6	±5.1	8.5	1.9	±3.7
Age18-64	37.0	1.1	±2.2	23.3	1.0	±1.9	22.1	1.0	±1.9	8.1	0.6	±1.1
Age 65+	34.0	1.1	±2.2	19.1	0.8	±1.6	22.5	1.0	±1.9			

6.3. Non-sampling error

Non-sampling errors are basically of 4 types:

- Coverage errors: errors due to divergences existing between the target population and the sampling frame.
- Measurement errors: errors that occur at the time of data collection. There are a number of sources for these errors such as the survey instrument, the information system, the interviewer and the mode of collection
- Processing errors: errors in post-data-collection processes such as data entry, keying, editing and weighting
- Non-response errors: errors due to an unsuccessful attempt to obtain the desired information from an eligible unit. Two main types of non-response errors are considered:

1. – Unit non-response: refers to absence of information of the whole units (households and/or persons) selected into the sample

1. – Item non-response: refers to the situation where a sample unit has been successfully enumerated, but not all required information has been obtained

Due to the lack of appropriate information, the new dwellings, built after 2011 Census of the Population and Dwellings have not been taken into account.

6.3.1. Coverage error

Coverage errors include over-coverage, under-coverage and misclassification:

- Over-coverage: relates either to wrongly classified units that are in fact out of scope, or to units that do not exist in practice
- Under-coverage: refers to units not included in the sampling frame
- Misclassification: refers to incorrect classification of units that belong to the target population

Over-coverage rate was estimated on the basis of the survey sample, as ratio between number of not-eligible dwellings (not-existing addresses, or being non-residential or unoccupied or not the main addresses) and number of sampled dwellings (all addresses selected). Over-coverage rate was 1.91%.

Under-coverage rate was estimated as the ratio between number of new dwellings, built in the period end of 2011 year (the year of the census) - end of 2015 year and number of dwellings at the end of 2015 year (Source: Romanian Statistical Yearbook, 2016). Thus, it was assumed that the proportion of the new dwellings in total dwellings should be the same in the master sample. Under-coverage rate was 2.02%.

6.3.1.1. Over-coverage - rate

	Main problems	Size of error
Cross sectional data	• Over-coverage	1.91%
	• Under-coverage	2.02%
	• Misclassification	

6.3.1.2. Common units - proportion

-

6.3.2. Measurement error

Cross sectional data

Source of measurement errors	Building process of questionnaire	Interview training	Quality control
As in any other survey, there are 3 main sources of measurement errors: - the questionnaires (1) - the interviewers (2) - the respondents (3)	We used three types of questionnaires: - the household file; -the household questionnaire, with the detailed questions regarding the household; - the individual questionnaire, which was fulfilled for each person 16 years or more, in order to record better the incomes of the people less than 16 years. The questionnaires were up-dated with the improvements based on the 2015 survey conclusions and the 2016 secondary module. The structure of questionnaires was the following: **The household file** included: - identification data; - the household composition - name, identificator, date of birth, sex, the relatives' code (mother's, father's and husband's/wife's), sample-person or co-resident, person's mobility compared with first wave, month and year when the current person left the household/came into the sampled household (if was the case), economic status during the income reference period etc.; - some questions about household identification; the household file is design and used all four years a person is included in the survey. **The household questionnaire** included: -identification data; -data regarding child care for all the children less than 13 years; - data regarding access services; -questions regarding economic situation of the household (housing and non-housing related arrears, non-monetary household deprivation questions); endowment with durable goods; -housing conditions including questions regarding information	The main challenge for the interviewers in the seventh wave was to administer the tracing rules. Beside this, the recording of the accurate incomes was the second very difficult task. A handbook was prepared with all the information available to help the interviewers in the fields work activities. Explanations for a big number of questions from all the questionnaires were included. Aspects related to the follow-up of households/persons and the construction of identifiers was explained in this handbook also. A special section included some recommendations about the behavior in the respondents' presence and the way the interviewers should convince population to participate to this survey. Other aspects: Some interviewers used very seldom some household identification numbers for the households and individuals from the new sub-sample, which were overlapped with some old households from the sub-samples which left the survey in 2013 and 2014; all these identification numbers were corrected.	For respondents, the most difficult information to declare was the value of incomes in the previous calendar year, the social insurance contribution and the taxes on wealth. Another difficult answer was related to the housing cost, also the question was preceding by a helping question in which they were asked what kind of housing cost that household is actually paying, in order to be sure the respondent is thinking at the elements of the housing cost are recommended by EU-SILC methodology to be included here. Another aspect which created some problems was the co-relation between the declaration of the marital status/consensual union between partners. There were cases in which one partner declared he is married and his/her partner declared he is in consensual union. These case were solved by taking with priority the idea of a consensual union in the case the partners have not the same family name. Some households found difficult to estimate the rent they would receive if they would rent the dwelling.

Cross sectional data

Source of measurement errors	Building process of questionnaire	Interview training	Quality control
	about dwelling installations and facilities, accessibility of basic needs, change of the dwelling, dwelling and dwelling environment, housing cost, amenities in the dwelling; -taxes paid at household level for the year 2015; -household incomes in 2015. **The individual questionnaire:** -identification data; -questions regarding de jure and de facto marital status; first and second citizenships; country of birth; year of immigration in Romania; -questions regarding the health status; limitations in activities due to a medical problem; unmeet need for medical, respectively dental consultation; reasons for the unmeet need for medical and dental consultation; -level of education questions (the school attended currently, the highest level of education attended and the year when the person graduated this level); -questions regarding the 2016 secondary module (Module on Access Services); -questions regarding detailed information about employment/non-employment; -individual incomes achieved in 2015. In order to help the data collection activities, other materials were designed by the methodological team: -*the letter for the households* – a paper sheet in which the objectives of the EU-SILC survey is presented, the importance of the people participation is highlighted and the confidentiality of the data is guarantied. -*the list of the dwelling and households included in the sample* (LG) is a document with two parts: first one included the exact addressees selected to carry-out the interviews. The second part included the situation found on the field for each address. This document is very useful for the interviewers and supervisors in order to check the integrity of the data collected. -*the tracing file*, was a paper sheet designed in order to identify households/persons which moved from the initial addresses from the first wave. The paper sheet fulfilled		

Cross sectional data

Source of measurement errors	Building process of questionnaire	Interview training	Quality control
	by the county from which they left were sent to the NIS methodological team and they sent again in the county where the information collected show they moved in. These counties proceeded to follow-up and interviewed them, in the case they founded.		

6.3.3. Non response error

Non-response errors are errors due to an unsuccessful attempt to obtain the desired information from an eligible unit. Two main types of non-response errors are considered:

1) Unit non-response which refers to the absence of information of the whole units (households and/or persons) selected into the sample. According the Commission Regulation 28/2004:

- **Household non-response rates** (NRh) is computed as follows:

NRh=(1-(Ra * Rh)) * 100

Where Ra is the address contact rate defined as:

Ra= Number of address successfully contacted/Number of valid addresses selected

and Rh is the proportion of complete household interviews accepted for the database

Rh=Number of household interviews completed and accepted for database/Number of eligible households at contacted addresses

- **Individual non-response rates** (NRp) will be computed as follows:

NRp=(1-(Rp)) * 100

Where Rp is the proportion of complete personal interviews within the households accepted for the database

Rp= Number of personal interview completed/Number of eligible individuals in the households whose interviews were completed and accepted for the database

- **Overall individual non-response rates** (*NRp) will be computed as follows:

*NRp=(1-(Ra * Rh * Rp)) * 100

For those Members States where a sample of persons rather than a sample of households (addresses) was selected, the individual non-response rates will be calculated for 'the selected respondent', for all individuals aged 16 years or older and for the non-selected respondent.

2) Item non-response which refers to the situation where a sample unit has been successfully enumerated, but not all the required information has been obtained.

6.3.3.1. Unit non-response - rate

Cross sectional data

Address contact rate (Ra)*		Complete household interviews (Rh)*		Complete personal interviews (Rp)*		Household Non-response rate (NRh)*		Individual non-response rate (NRp)*		Overall individual non-response rate (NRp)*	
A*	B*	A*	B*	A*	B*	A*	B*	A*	B*	A*	B*
97.09%	96.78%	95.35%	85.16%	99.75%	99.68%	7.42%	17.58%	0.25%	0.32%	7.65%	17.84%

* All the formulas are defined in the Commission Regulation 28/2004, Annex II

A* = Total sample; B = * New sub-sample

6.3.3.2. Item non-response - rate

The computation of item non-response is essential to fulfil the precision requirements concerning publication as stated in the Commission Regulation No 1982/2003. Item non-response rate is provided for the main income variables both at household and personal level.

We have no item non-response due to the checking programs used at the county level which show these missing data and the supervisors have to solve it: first of all, the questionnaire is checked in order to find if it is an operator's mistake and secondly, the household is asked again if the information was not supplied from the beginning. Finnaly, item non-response imputation is applied, if it is the case.

6.3.3.2.1. Item non-response rate by indicator

	Total hh gross income (HY010)	Total disposable hh income (HY020)	Total disposable hh income before social transfers other than old-age and survivors benefits (HY022)	Total disposable hh income before all social transfers (HY023)

	Total hh gross income (HY010)	Total disposable hh income (HY020)	Total disposable hh income before social transfers other than old-age and survivors benefits (HY022)	Total disposable hh income before all social transfers (HY023)
% of household having received an amount	2013 - 99.22 2014 - 99.03 2015 - 98.61 2016 - 98.60	2013 - 99.17 2014 - 98.97 2015 - 98.79 2016 - 98.61	2013 - 96.50 2014 - 96.79 2015 - 96.89 2016 - 96.60	2013 - 57.57 2014 - 57.29 2015 - 58.04 2016 - 57.87
% of household with missing values (before imputation)	2013 - 0.78 2014 - 0.97 2015 - 1.39 2016 - 1.40	2013 - 0.83 2014 - 1.03 2015 - 1.21 2016 - 1.39	2013 - 3.50 2014 - 3.21 2015 - 3.11 2016 - 3.40	2013 - 42.43 2014 - 42.71 2015 - 41.96 2016 - 42.13
% of household with partial information (before imputation)	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00

-

	Imputed rent (HY030)	Income from rental of property or land (HY040)	Family/ Children related allowances (HY050)	Social exclusion payments not elsewhere classified (HY060)	Housing allowances (HY070)	Regular inter-hh cash transfers received (HY080)	Interest, dividends, profit from capital investments in incorporated businesses (HY090)
% of household having received an amount	2013 - 98.49 2014 - 97.70 2015 - 98.16 2016 - 98.88	2013 - 0.57 2014 - 0.79 2015 - 0.20 2016 - 0.04	2013 - 19.99 2014 - 19.06 2015 - 23.84 2016 - 19.12	2013 - 7.25 2014 - 6.74 2015 - 0.91 2016 - 4.17	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 3.03 2014 - 2.53 2015 - 1.01 2016 - 2.12	2013 - 0.52 2014 - 0.76 2015 - 11.15 2016 - 1.12
% of household with missing values (before imputation)	2013 - 1.51 2014 - 2.3 2015 - 1.84 2016 - 1.12	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00
% of household with partial information (before imputation)	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00

	Cash or near-cash employee income (PY010)	Other non-cash employee income (PY020)	Income from private use of company car (PY021)	Employers social insurance contributions (PY030)	Cash profits or losses from self-employment (PY050)	Value of goods produced for own consumption (PY070)	Unemployment benefits (PY090)	Old-age benefits (PY100)	Survivors benefits (PY110)	Sickness benefits (PY120)	Disability benefits (PY130)	Education-related allowances (PY140
% of household having received an amount	2013 - 32.45 2014 - 31.84 2015 - 32.47 2016 - 32.57	2013 - 0.33 2014 - 0.29 2015 - 0.40 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.33 2014 - 0.05 2015 - 0.40 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 12.07 2014 - 12.18 2015 - 12.38 2016 - 11.94	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.10 2014 - 0.19 2015 - 0.08 2016 - 0.06	2013 - 33.70 2014 - 33.94 2015 - 32.79 2016 - 33.01	2013 - 6.89 2014 - 6.93 2015 - 5.79 2016 - 5.46	2013 - 0.03 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.04 2016 - 0.03	2013 - 2.98 2014 - 3.09 2015 - 2.99 2016 - 3.09	2013 - 0.10 2014 - 0.19 2015 - 0.21 2016 - 0.14

	Cash or near-cash employee income (PY010)	Other non-cash employee income (PY020)	Income from private use of company car (PY021)	Employers social insurance contributions (PY030)	Cash profits or losses from self-employment (PY050)	Value of goods produced for own consumption (PY070)	Unemployment benefits (PY090)	Old-age benefits (PY100)	Survivors benefits (PY110)	Sickness benefits (PY120)	Disability benefits (PY130)	Education-related allowances (PY140)
% of household with missing values (before imputation)	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00
% of household with partial information (before imputation)	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00	2013 - 0.00 2014 - 0.00 2015 - 0.00 2016 - 0.00

6.3.4. Processing error

Data entry and coding

During the field work period and data processing period several checks were done. Data editing and cleaning was done in two steps: firstly, at the level of each county and secondly, after the counties' files will be sent to INS team, a second check was done by EU-SILC central team. At the county level, after data collection, supervisors had the duty to check the integrity of the questionnaires (one household file and at least one household questionnaire per household and as many personal questionnaires as household members 16 years and more exists). During data entry, checking software was applied at county level. The counties sent the files at central level and a new check was done on the national files. The checking software included 3 types of checks: checks at each questionnaire level (household and personal questionnaires), checks for the correlation between the information included in household and personal questionnaires, and a third type of checks, integrity checks, if all the addresses included in the sample were visited (if questionnaires completed exist for each address included in the sample). Inside each type of questionnaire there were 2 types of logical conditions: to see if all the compulsory questions were fulfilled and to check if the answers were correct (for quantitative variables minimal and maximal limits were established, and for qualitative variables logical conditions were tested). After the data files in the EUROSTAT format were obtained, a third data check was done, using the EUROSTAT software available on Circa user group. The process of cleaning the data took a long time and imposed special efforts both from the county teams and central methodological team in order to obtain the 4 micro-data files in Eurostat format, due to the big number of variables and numerous correlations between them. A special kind of difficulties were related to the special codification of the split-off/moved households/persons in the original files.

Editing controls

The checking software included 3 types of checks: checks at each questionnaire level (household and personal questionnaires), checks for the correlation between the information included in household and personal questionnaires, and a third type of checks, integrity checks, if all the addresses included in the sample were visited (if questionnaires completed exist for each address included in the sample). Inside each type of questionnaire there were 2 types of logical conditions: to see if all the compulsory questions were fulfilled and to check if the answers were correct (for quantitative variables minimal and maximal limits were established, and for qualitative variables logical conditions were tested).

After the data files in the EUROSTAT format were obtained, a third data check was done, using the EUROSTAT software available on Circa user group.

The process of cleaning the data took a long time and imposed special efforts both from the county teams and central methodological team in order to obtain the 4 micro-data files in EUROSTAT format, due to the big number of variables and numerous correlations between them. A more detailed analysis of the checking conditions should be make in the next waves in order to add more checks to the checking software.

6.3.4.1. Imputation - rate

-

6.3.5. Model assumption error

-

6.4. Seasonal adjustment
-

6.5. Data revision - policy
-

6.6. Data revision - practice
-
6.6.1. Data revision - average size
-

7. Timeliness and punctuality

-

7.1. Timeliness
-
7.1.1. Time lag - first result
-
7.1.2. Time lag - final result
-

7.2. Punctuality
-
7.2.1. Punctuality - delivery and publication
-

8. Coherence and comparability

According to the Regulation (EC) No 1177/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning EU-SILC: "Comparability of data between Member States shall be a fundamental objective and shall be pursued through the development of methodological studies from the outset of EU-SILC data collection, carried out in close collaboration between the Member States and Eurostat".

Although the best way for keeping the comparability of data is to apply the same methods and definitions of variables, small departures of the definitions given by Eurostat are allowed in EU-SILC. In this way, the mentioned Regulation in its article 16th says: "Small departures from common definitions, such as those relating to private household definition and income reference period, shall be allowed, provided they affect comparability only marginally. The impact of comparability shall be reported in the quality reports."

The coherence of two or more statistical outputs refers to the degree to which the statistical processes, by which they were generated, used the same concepts and harmonised methods. A comparison with external sources for all income target variables and the number of persons who receive income from each 'income component' will be provided, where the Member States concerned consider such external data to be sufficiently reliable.

8.1. Comparability - geographical
-
8.1.1. Asymmetry for mirror flow statistics - coefficient
-

8.1.2. Reference population

Reference population	Private household definition	Household membership
The reference population is all private households and their current members residing in the territory of the Romania at the time of data collection. Persons living in collective households and in institutions are excluded from the target population.	Household is defined as a person living alone or a group of persons who live together in the same dwelling and share expenditures including the joint provision of the essentials of living.	We used the same household membership definition as the Eurostat recommended in the document EU-SILC 065.

8.1.3. Reference Period

Period for taxes on income and social insurance contributions	Income reference periods used	Reference period for taxes on wealth	Lag between the income ref period and current variables
No departure from the common definition. The repayments and receipts for tax adjustment referring to the income taxes recalculated for the global income gained in 2014 and they were collected if there were paid/received during the calendar 2015.	No departure from the common definition. We used a fixed income reference period of twelve-month, more exactly the previous calendar year (January – December 2015).		No departure from the common definition.

8.2. Comparability - over time

A very exact comparison between incomes from HBS and EU-SILC data is not possible due to some methodological differences, more exactly, differences at the level of income elements collected and included in the EU-SILC.

The differences between these two surveys it is possible to be due to the greater value of the income taxes and social insurance contributions for wages, own account activities and pensions in EU-SILC, where these elements are automatical calculated (if the person declared there were paid). In HBS the person should declare himself the value of these components in the diary.

Revenues were collected in the survey HBS as the reference period this year, while in the EU-SILC survey, the reference period of the revenues is the previous year.

A better comparison can be made between at-risk-of-poverty indicators calculated from both surveys.

	2015	2016
	HBS	EU-SILC
Poverty threshold –lei, for one person annually-	7806	6530
At-risk-of-poverty rate (after all social transfers) -%-	21.8	25.3
Dispersion around the poverty threshold -%-		
- at-risk-of-poverty rate at 40% of median	8.6	13.5
- at-risk-of-poverty rate at 50% of median	14.8	19.2
- at-risk-of-poverty rate at 70% of median	28.8	30.7
Relative median risk-of-poverty gap -%-	26.5	36.2
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers -%-		
- including pensions	48.3	49.6
- excluding pensions	22.4	29.5
S80/S20 quartile share ratio	5.5	7.2
Gini Coefficient -%-	31.8	34.7

Annexes:
Household questionnaire
Individual questionnaire
Household file
RB250_RB260

8.2.1. Length of comparable time series
-

8.3. Coherence - cross domain
A very exact comparison between incomes from HBS and EU-SILC data is not possible due to some methodological differences, more exactly, differences at the level of income elements collected and included in the EU-SILC. The differences between these two surveys it is possible to be due to the greater value of the income taxes and social insurance contributions for wages, own account activities and pensions in EU-SILC, where these elements are automatical calculated (if the person declared there were paid). In HBS the person should declare himself the value of these components in the diary. A better comparison can be made between at-risk-of-poverty indicators calculated from both surveys.

8.4. Coherence - sub annual and annual statistics
-

8.5. Coherence - National Accounts
-

8.6. Coherence - internal
-

9. Accessibility and clarity

-

9.1. Dissemination format - News release
-

9.2. Dissemination format - Publications
-

9.3. Dissemination format - online database

-

    9.3.1. Data tables - consultations

-

9.4. Dissemination format - microdata access

-

9.5. Dissemination format - other

-

9.6. Documentation on methodology

-

9.7. Quality management - documentation

-

    9.7.1. Metadata completeness - rate

-

    9.7.2. Metadata - consultations

-

10. Cost and Burden

-

11. Confidentiality

-

11.1. Confidentiality - policy

-

11.2. Confidentiality - data treatment

-

12. Comment

-

Related metadata

Annexes

[RB250](#)
[RB260](#)
[Household questionnaire 2016](#)
[Individual questionnaire 2016](#)
[File household 2016](#)