

Rolling Review

Tourism Statistics

Executive Summary

March 2013

Table of contents

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS.....	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
1 INTRODUCTION	4
1.1 Tourism Statistics produced by Eurostat	4
1.2 Tourism Statistics – Definitions and Coverage.....	5
1.3 Eurostat Programme for Tourism Statistics.....	6
2 SUMMARY OF RESULTS FROM THE INDEPENDENT SURVEYS	7
2.1 User Survey	7
2.2 Self-Assessment Checklist.....	9
2.3 Partner Survey	9
3 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT.....	11
3.1 Context: Eurostat Vision	11
3.2 Strengths and Weaknesses of Eurostat Tourism Statistics	12
3.4 Recommendations on improvement actions on data production.....	13
3.5 Overall.....	14

Abbreviations and acronyms

BSDG	Business Statistics Directors Group
CNA	Competent National Authority
CSO	Central Statistical Office
CVD	Data Life Cycle
EBB	Editing Building Block (Web)
EFTA	European Free Trade Area
ESAC	European Statistical Advisory Committee
ESGAB	European Statistical Governance Advisory Board
ESMS	Euro-SDMX Metadata Structure
ESS	European Statistical System
ESSC	European Statistical System Committee
EU	European Union
GFC	Global Financial Crisis
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IRTS	International Recommendations on Tourism Statistics
ISCED	International Standard Classification of Education
MS	Member States
NACE	Nomenclature générale des activités économiques dans les Communautés Européennes
NUTS	Nomenclature of Statistical Territorial Units
NSI	National Statistical Institutes
TSA	Tourism Satellite Account
UNWTO	United Nations World Tourism Organisation

Executive Summary

1 Introduction

This Report refers to the European tourism statistics produced and disseminated by Unit G3 of Eurostat.

In 2007 Eurostat set up a Quality Assurance Framework related to streamlining the existing quality activities within Eurostat and to position them in the wider framework of the European Statistics Code of Practice and Total Quality management. Within this framework Rolling Reviews are one of the tools used to carry out a more complex assessment in a wider sense involving not only the appraisal of the statistical data produced but also the process of compiling them, the working structures (i.e. the interactions with users of the data) and the data quality. The aim of such an assessment through rolling reviews is the definition of improvement actions for a better performance of the European Statistical System in each statistical domain.

The methodology of the currently implemented Rolling Review identifies strengths and weaknesses in Eurostat's performance. This review was implemented between January 2012 and December 2012, and conducted in three parts:

1. a user satisfaction survey,
2. the completion of a checklist by the professional staff within Eurostat Unit G3, assessing all major steps within the data production cycle, and
3. a partner satisfaction survey.

The findings from each of these independent investigations were then brought together to formulate an assessment of how the process of tourism statistics on Europe, as compiled by Eurostat's Unit G3, might be improved.

1.1 Tourism Statistics produced by Eurostat

This Rolling Review deals with the collection and dissemination of European tourism statistics. The Eurostat tourism statistics that are released include:

1. Capacity of tourist accommodation establishments – annual;
2. Number of nights spent and number of arrivals, by residents and by non-residents, at collective accommodation establishments - monthly/annual;
3. Number of tourists (participation in tourism of the population) – annual;
4. Number of trips made, number of nights spent, tourist expenditure by residents of the reporting countries – annual.

The data covers EU Member States, EU Candidate States and EFTA countries. It is aggregated and numerical data.

The European Legal Basis has been Directive 95/57/EC for reference periods to end 2011. From 2012 it is Regulation (EU) 692/2011. Quality of reporting is governed by

- Art. 8(1) of Directive 95/57;
- Art.6 of Regulation 692/2011 (and Annex I of Implementing Regulation 1051/2011).

Statistical Concepts and Definitions follow the IRTS 2008 (International Recommendations for Tourism Statistics) and the Methodological Manual for Tourism Statistics (in the ESS).

More than 60 tables are available on the Eurostat Website under the broad headings below¹:

Tourism (tour)

- *Capacity of collective tourist accommodation: establishments, bedrooms and bed-places (tour_cap)*
- *Occupancy in collective accommodation establishments: domestic and inbound tourism (tour_occ)*
- *Tourism demand: domestic and outbound tourism (excluding day-trips) (tour_dem)*
- *Tourism employment - (Source: Labour Force Survey) (tour_lfs)*
- *Indicators on internal tourism (tour_int)*

All of these can be downloaded in standard user formats such as Excel for further analysis as required by the user. Metadata is available for the various Tables. In addition there are special subject analyses presented by Unit G3 in ‘Statistics in Focus’. Recent examples include ‘Tourism in Europe : Results for 2011’ (28/2012), which focused on holiday and business trips, and ‘Ageing and Tourism’ (43/2012) which took a closer look at tourism trends and preferences in the European Union, with particular emphasis on the 65+ age group. In producing such analyses, which are substantial tasks and extremely useful, Unit G3 statisticians sometimes do not have data which can apply to all 27 EU member states and it becomes necessary to either estimate and impute what is not available or to carry out partial analyses with those countries where the data is available. The Tourism Unit produced ‘Tourism Statistics Pocketbook’ (2008) covering the years 2000-2006, and ‘Panorama on Tourism’ (2008). Also several methodological issues have been addressed including Tourism Satellite Accounts and Sustainability Indicators etc. Overall it is an impressive body of work from what is a small team in terms of staff (four).

1.2 Tourism Statistics – Definitions and Coverage

The international recommendations for the definitions of tourism statistics are contained in the IRTS 2008, published by the United Nations et alia.

The definitions can present challenges in the collection and compilation of tourism statistics. Particular issues tend to surround:

- travelling outside of an individual’s ‘usual environment’;
- BoP travel concept versus visitor concept of tourism statistics (e.g. definition);
- comparability of country data (e.g. mirror data, accommodation statistics versus sample surveys);
- coherence of business statistics (e.g. SBS) and accommodation statistics;
- purpose of travel, which includes both business travel and personal travel. Within personal travel it includes visiting friends and relatives as well as holiday/leisure travel;
- tourism includes both same-day visitors (sometimes called excursionists) and tourists (which are persons staying overnight);
- accommodation used for staying overnight which can include staying with friends and relatives even though on a holiday or a business trip, staying in various private accommodation, staying in an owned second home etc.

The new Regulation (EU) No 692/2011 addresses the issues of same-day visits, means of accommodation that covers accommodation provided without charge by relatives or friends, own holiday home, and other non-rented accommodation. It also addresses the issue of trips for the purposes of visiting friends and relatives (VFR).

¹ Data available in February 2013

1.3 Eurostat Programme for Tourism Statistics

The published Work plan for tourism statistics (theme 3.05) was as shown below for 2012.

	2012 Statistics Work plan Action	Output
NEW WORK	Tourism statistics: feasibility study on the use of mobile positioning data for tourism statistics	Evaluation Report
	Implementation of new Regulation on European statistics on tourism. Preparation of databases and validation programs for reception of data (incl. micro-data)	Production database ready for receiving, validating and processing data
ONGOING WORK	Tourism statistics: dissemination. Regularly updated online database, regular and ad-hoc publications (paper/web), presentation of results in events & meetings.	Dissemination database
	Tourism Statistics: production - Successful validation of databases	Production database
	Tourism statistics: methodological developments - New methodologies	Continuous improvement of tourism statistics methodology
	ESSnet on automated data collection and reporting in accommodation statistics (phase 1)	System of automated data collection for tourism accommodation statistics

Two significant projects in the above list are the investigations into:

- Mobile positioning data for tourism statistics;
- Automated data collection from accommodation units for tourism accommodation statistics;

Both these initiatives are in line with the approaches set out in Regulation 223/2009. In effect, can innovative statistics reduce costs and reduce respondent burdens but still provide the tourism statistics required for economic decision-making, planning, and policy initiatives at the level of Europe?

Obviously there are many difficulties associated with this because Europe is an evolving entity with a wide range of cultures/ systems/ attitudes and considerable economic disparity between Member States along with different currencies for exchange. ‘Statistics’, as the empirical science of ‘the State’, is clearly a challenge at the European level in all statistics, not just tourism.

2 Summary of results from the independent surveys

2.1 User Survey

As part of the rolling review, a sample survey of users was carried out (N=147 respondents, assumed as representative of all users). The survey consisted of two major topic areas:

Part A: Need for statistical data on tourism statistics (on the part of the respondent)

Part B: Assessment of data quality of tourism statistics disseminated by Eurostat

Part A: Need for Tourism Statistics

In response to the question of the influence of the tourism statistics on their work, some 46% of respondents indicated that they were essential / important whilst 42% indicated that they were of value as background. Some 12% indicated that they were of minor importance or indeed of no use. Some 36% used the statistics on a monthly or more frequent basis, 36% on a quarterly basis, 19% used them annually and 9% at longer intervals.

There was a strong relationship between the value of the statistics and the frequency of use. Of those users with a frequency of monthly or more frequent use some 74% judged the statistics as essential/important, whilst for users with an annual or longer interval of use only 17% judged the tourism statistics as essential/important for their work.

The most frequent purposes in using the tourism statistics were research (58%), general background information (52%), comparison with other data (49%), trend analysis (48%) and market analysis (46%). Given the number of universities/ research institutes the importance of research is self-evident, but there are still significant proportions using the statistics for forecasting (9%), policy purposes (9%), decision-making in business (8%) and project purposes (12%).

For respondents the main products used are the database website (65%) and the Main Tables website (55%). 'Statistics in Focus' is the third most used product at 38% followed by the 'Press Releases' (28%).

Many users indicate that they would like to see more tourism statistics at a European level. Such new statistics are broadly in four themes:

- Economics (macroeconomics as represented by TSAs, regional statistics and employment);
- Segmentation in tourism (as represented by day trips, outbound, motivations etc.);
- The tourism industry operators (as represented by the economic/ financial situation of tourist companies – microeconomics);
- Sustainability (indicators).

The feasibility and costs of expanding the European (Eurostat) statistics have not been considered. But the fact that users want more such statistics can be seen as a positive view on what is currently being provided.

Part B: Assessment of Data Quality

The User survey asked respondents to assess the quality of Eurostat tourism statistics against six headings, as indicated by Implementing Regulation (EU) 1051/2011:

Concept	Percentage rating as 'very good' or 'good'
Relevance	60%
Timeliness	45%
Comparability	49%
Accuracy	63%
Accessibility (and Clarity)	61%
Coherence	50%

The overall results can be described as highly positive of the output and data quality of the Eurostat tourism statistics. There are no significant numbers of users indicating poor ratings. Overall it is a creditable outcome.

Suggestions for improvements varied.

- For relevance, the suggestions related to greater regional detail and to 'all accommodation'.
- For accuracy, respondents referred to harmonisation, methodologies, types of surveys, geographical coverage, administrative units, concepts etc.
- For timeliness, the main requirement was for earlier provisional data, with an automatic notification of later updates.

"In the ever-changing trends of the tourism market, time is of the essence"

- For accessibility (and clarity), most of those responding indicated that the user had struggled with access. They felt that it could be more user-friendly.
- For comparability, suggestions largely revolved around definitions, methodologies, harmonisation, and metadata.
- For coherence, a specific suggestion made was for a *"Greater effort to harmonize data collection tools"*. A typical point is as made below by different respondents:

"this is the major problem in tourism statistics in general even within a single country, no coherence is guaranteed between the supply and demand sides, between the various source surveys: e.g. household surveys and accommodation surveys."

With respect to metadata, only 44% of respondents said that they knew of the metadata. Some 69% of the 44% (so 31% of all respondents) had used the metadata. Some 53% of the respondents (who had used the metadata) rated the metadata as 'good' or 'very good', 36% as 'adequate' and 10% as 'poor'.

Only 24% of respondents knew about Eurostat's supporting services, and only 8% of all respondents had used such services.

Looking at overall data quality and supporting services, some 65% of the respondents (N=128) scored them as 'very good' or 'good'. This can be seen as a creditable outcome.

Suggestions for improvements in dissemination revolve around more-handly database, more up to date publications, more user friendly interface, more interactive/user driven query tools, more use of mapping and other visualisation tools, and automatic notification when a dataset is updated.

2.2 Self-Assessment Checklist

The checklist prepared by Eurostat staff (Unit G3) indicated that the statistical collection process was well established. This is reflected in the high quality documentation which is kept up to date. The validation processes in partners and in Eurostat work well and are under continuous review as new issues emerge. Contributing to this overall picture is the firm legal base and the active engagement of partners in ensuring the quality in the collection process.

The known unmet needs of key users are estimated by the Unit G3 to be

- ‘advanced’ information on the economic importance of tourism (e.g. TSAs);
- better integration with other statistics (especially business statistics);
- full coverage of inbound tourist flows;
- very up-to-date and recent data (especially in the context of monitoring the effects of crisis – e.g. GFC - on tourism).

Unit G3 raises the issue that many countries use a dedicated "tourism register", but even if this is perceived (by the country) as superior to the regular business register, it jeopardises the comparability/coherence with other statistics.

Releasing information on the data disseminated on tourism is done via:

- Dedicated section on Eurostat website;
- ‘Statistics Explained’ on the Eurostat website;
- ESMS (previously SDDS) files;
- Footnotes/flags.

Metadata is seen as good and is available in the public database (Eurobase). Information is documented on the quality of the key statistics.

2.3 Partner Survey

As part of the Rolling Review the partners CNAs (Competent National Authorities) were asked to assess aspects of Eurostat’s operations in the provision of European tourism statistics, including their views on data quality. The survey was in three parts:

- PART A: Planning, functioning and role of Eurostat
- PART B: Assessment of data quality
- PART C: Resources

The outcome of the survey was that 22 out of 38 partners (CNAs) responded. This gives a response level of only 58%, and 42% non-response.

Part A - Planning, functioning and role in tourism statistics

Overall, respondents’ views on the planning and functioning of tourism statistics in the ESS indicate that it all works well. Respondents score Eurostat highly on the functioning of instruments for online exchange, level of general responsiveness and cooperation, and the standing of Eurostat in tourism statistics.

Some 73% of respondents were familiar with the links between the Annual and Five Years Community Statistical Programmes. Some 91% of the respondents had attended the Working Groups, but only 41% had participated in the Task Force. The ratings are high for the measures associated with the links between programmes (73% rating as ‘very good’ or ‘good’) and for the possibility of influencing the decisions inside the Task Force (78%). The respondents gave a lower rating to the possibility of influencing the decisions inside the Working Group (55%).

The overall assessment of the functioning of the ESS (tourism) is a creditable 64% scoring as ‘very good’ or ‘good’. In general, the direction of change over the last three years is seen by respondents as one of improvements (68% indicating as ‘better’ or ‘much better’). This seems a clear endorsement of the performance and direction of change of the team involved in the production and management of European tourism statistics.

The following instruments were reviewed and they all were rated highly:

- CIRCA (71% rating as ‘very good’ or ‘good’)
- eDAMIS (68%)
- Excel Data Templates (82%)
- EUROSTAT web site (65%)

The highest rating was given to the Excel templates especially tailored by Unit G3 to the requirements for tourism statistics. Respondents score the staff of the Eurostat unit at an exceptional level with respect to technical competence and professionalism.

With regard to the level of leadership and steering capability of Eurostat, the respondents’ scores were low for ‘Strategic Vision’ (44%) and ‘ability to convince others’ (35%).

Part B - Assessment of data quality

Concept	Percentage Rating as ‘Very good’ or ‘good’
Accuracy	75%
Timeliness	80%
Accessibility	55%
Clarity	30%
Comparability	53%
Coherence	50%
Completeness	35%

The survey asked the partners for their assessment of the quality of the tourism data provided by Eurostat against seven dimensions, paralleling those provided by users. These are the views of the partners (the national providers of tourism statistics). Whilst the data quality for timeliness and accuracy are relatively high, some of the other quality dimensions are seen in less favourable terms. Clarity and Completeness are the lowest rated of the dimensions for data quality. Overall, data quality is good.

Part C – Resources

Respondents estimated the resources used in the production of tourism statistics data for the European Union by estimating the potential savings in human resources. Whilst recognising that the estimates can be seen as ‘rough and ready’ the median estimate from respondents for the reduction in the burden for the NSI/CNA, if European tourism statistics were not prepared, was -10%. For businesses the median estimate of the possible reduction in burden was – 0.5%. Respondents’ views would suggest that the burden for businesses is marginal, whilst the burden for CNAs is significant but, arguably, not large.

Benefits

The benefits of the European tourism statistics were mostly perceived by respondents as comparability (76%), harmonisation (48%), methodological improvements (19%), improved development of surveys (14%), and benchmarking (10%).

3 Conclusions and recommendations for improvement

The findings from each of the above three independent investigations form the basis of the assessment of how the process of the tourism statistics produced by Eurostat's Unit G3, might be improved. In addition there were discussions/ interviews with a number of key persons involved with European tourism statistics.

3.1 Context: Eurostat Vision

The context for improvements can be seen as the vision of Eurostat to make changes in its approach to the production of European statistics². Regulation (EC) No 223/2009 of the European Parliament on European Statistics strengthened the cooperation in the European Statistical System (ESS) and gave emphasis to a number of approaches, including:

- A focus on cost-effectiveness (in Article 2);
- A focus on collaborative networks (in Article 15), and
- A European approach to statistics (in Article 16)

The challenge is to make use of cooperation and standardisation as far as possible while respecting the subsidiarity principle. The relatively difficult situation facing NSIs has been documented in terms of

- Need to reduce costs and increase efficiency
- Increasing demands for statistical products
- Reduction of respondent's burden
- Improvements in quality
- Progress in information technology

It looks likely that the NSIs/ CNAs will be under severe pressures in the next five years to reduce costs in all aspects – data collection, compilation, analysis etc.

Starting points for Eurostat solutions have been perceived as including: -

- Standardisation of processes
- Re-use of available data (administrative sources, online link to business accounting and other instruments of eGovernment etc.)
- Common infrastructure (registers, meta-data, geo-spatial information)
- Collaborative networks, common tools and knowledge sharing

Overall this has been presented as a 'Re-engineering of statistical production' from 'Stovepipes' to 'Multiple Source Mix Mode'. This approach applies to all statistics including tourism statistics.

Tourism statistics have some special features, including:

- consumer demand led activity;
- a wide spread of medium, small and micro suppliers of tourism services, as well as large suppliers;
- the location movements in the demand, which are sensitive to many different factors, including prices/ costs, competitive supply offers, changes in tastes etcetera ; and
- the crossing of international borders for both inbound and outbound tourism.

The fast-changing and volatile nature of tourism makes it a difficult domain for statistical collection and analysis.

² Communication from The Commission to the European Parliament and The Council on the Production Method of EU Statistics: A Vision for the Next Decade

3.2 Strengths and Weaknesses of Eurostat Tourism Statistics

The overall impression given of the Eurostat tourism statistics process is of a stable, well established collection system, which produces statistics of high quality for its ‘customers/users’. It manages this without overburdening its partners or the organisations involved in supplying them with the basic data.

The respondents to the partner survey (22 CNAs) outlined the principal strengths and weaknesses involved in the system of Eurostat tourism statistics

Principal Strengths:

- Positive responses on planning, functioning and role of Eurostat
- Functioning and Standing of Eurostat is scored highly
- Respondents score the staff of the Eurostat unit at an exceptional level with respect to technical competence and professionalism.
- Direction of change is seen as one of improvements
- Changes from Council Directive 95/97/EC to Regulation 692/2011 are not perceived as creating major issues for partners
- Assessment of Data Quality is high
- Response and Provider burden is estimated as:
 - for CNAs - 10% reduction if no European tourism statistics
 - for businesses - 0.5% reduction if no European tourism statistics

Principal Weaknesses:

The principal weaknesses indicated by Partners related to three areas of operation, namely coordination, availability of information on Eurostat operations, and the level of leadership and steering capability of Eurostat. What Partners indicated that they would like to see more of are the following:

In the matter of coordination:

- More information on differences in national systems of data collection and on different national practices in data production and data treatment
- More capability of the ESS to learn from best practices in the field of tourism data production (including from the Member States)

In the matter of the availability of information on Eurostat:

- More information on new and ongoing ESS tourism projects
- More information on financial resources of Eurostat for tourism projects

On the level of leadership and steering capability of Eurostat:

- More ‘Strategic vision’ from Eurostat

3.3 Recommendations on the Tourism Statistics Programme

The interpretation of the Findings is that NSIs/CNAs, all of whom are under considerable pressure, are looking to Eurostat to indicate where solutions might be found for:

- More cost-effective data collection;
- How to reduce respondent and provider burdens;
- What new European tourism statistics can be provided in the light of users’ demands but within the context of the constraints on budgets for the NSIs/CNAs.

The Eurostat Unit G3 programme should have a substantial emphasis on the aspirations in Regulation 223/2009, notably reduction of burdens for providers, along with clarity about the selection of investigative programmes (e.g. the feasibility study of the mobile positioning data) and what is going to

be achieved by them. Suitable Agendas in the Working Group and the Task Force should make it possible to develop a Strategic vision for the programme for European tourism statistics, which can be endorsed by the Working Group and in this way give strength to the initiatives proposed by Eurostat or indeed proposed by the Member States.

To turn this into an operational initiative, it can be linked with the findings from the Partner Survey on coordination, availability of information on Eurostat operations, and the level of ‘strategic vision’.

Consequently, the recommendation is that the process should allow that the future annual programmes for European tourism Statistics, are discussed in the Working Group. It is appreciated that eventual agreement to the programme occurs in an inter-service consultation and at ESSC level, but nonetheless endorsement at technical level would provide an appropriate balance.

The specific action would be to ensure that ‘Discussion and Endorsement of the Annual Programme’ is on the agenda of the Working Group as a formal item (Recommendation A1).

3.4 Recommendations on improvement actions on data production

Potential improvements for data production which are recommended include:

- Tourism registers need to be in line with business registers for cross-checking, basically allowing the start of Europe-wide inventories for tourism (Recommendation B1). The Registers (formal lists) are of businesses etc. from which inventories (counts) can be made of the relevant tourism facilities/ units, as required, on a Europe-wide basis. Access to such inventories will offer Eurostat the opportunity for cost reductions for NSIs/CNAs in data collection when using sampling as the means for obtaining statistical estimates at a Europe-wide level.
- In response to suggestions by some users Eurostat should consider undertaking some tourism sample surveys that are Europe-wide, with the aim of achieving comparability Europe-wide, as well as reducing the burdens upon the national providers. The specific recommendation is to see where a Europe-wide sample survey could achieve large savings for NSIs /CNAs and at the same time provide data on the whole spectrum of tourism travel (inbound international, outbound international, domestic and excursionists, all purposes of travel, and all accommodation used) (Recommendation B2).
- Information from Users and from Partners is that there is a need for European statistics that address the economic contribution of tourism. This is also seen as a gap by Unit G3. Consequently it is recommended that the Tourism Satellite Account work should be brought back onto the Eurostat agenda, linking in with the work carried out by UNWTO and ILO (Employment in Table 7) (Recommendation B3).
- Regulation (EU) 692/2011 has addressed several of the issues regarding the coverage of the tourism statistics (helping to cover many of the existing gaps) but there are many technical issues which will require special attention e.g. tour operator spending on behalf of tourists, package tour prices etc. A Special initiative will be required to put together the approach to such input statistics for the micro-data analyses and this needs to be done via the Working Group/ Task Force and Collaborative networks (still to be set up). Such an initiative should go onto the agenda of the Working Group Meetings (Recommendation B4).

Improving data and metadata dissemination

- To address the issue of timeliness for the users (as suggested by a number of users), the national data should be published when it becomes available in Eurostat’s databases prior to incorporation within the European aggregates. (Recommendation C1)

- To address the issue of the dissemination of statistics and metadata, whilst it is recognised that electronic communication is cost-effective, there is still the opportunity to extend the understanding of the methodologies of tourism statistics (especially for new methodologies) through seminars/ conferences especially to wider audiences for the European stakeholders. This is widely supported by users and partners (Recommendation C2).
- In response to suggestions by users, review the issues of accessibility/metadata/ease of use for the Tourism Main Tables on the Website (Recommendation C3).

Improving data quality

- Unit G3 continues to pursue data quality through improved processes, with the Eurostat emphasis on definitions, harmonisation, thresholds, timeliness and completeness (Recommendation D1)
- An improvement idea, already planned by Unit G3, is that the Unit G3 provides validation tools (EBB) directly to Member States for the validation of micro-data transmission (Recommendation D2)

3.5 Overall

The approach of continuing to raise these matters in the Working Group / Task Force to find ways in which improvements can be made is the right one.

Whilst the outstanding efforts of the current staff are recognised, in the future there may be a need to strengthen staff numbers and expertise, especially with the tasks of analysing the micro-data (complex sampling methodologies) and the task of developing the TSAs (national accounting expertise).

ID	Direction of Improvement/ Recommendation	Priority	Source	Owner	Timing
A) The annual statistics programmes should be discussed and endorsed within the Working Group					
A1	The recommendation is that the process should allow that the future annual programmes for Eurostat tourism statistics are discussed in the Working Group. Ensure that 'Discussion and Endorsement of the Annual Programme' is on the agenda of the Working Group as a formal item.	1	PS	G3	Short-term
B) Improving data production through better registers, new sample surveys, new initiatives for analyses					
B1	Tourism registers need to be in line with business registers for cross-checking	2	CL	G3	Long-term
B2	Eurostat should see where a Europe-wide sample survey could achieve large savings for NSIs /CNAs and at the same time provide data on the whole spectrum of tourism travel.	3	PS US	G3	Long-term
B3	The Tourism Satellite Accounts for Member States should be brought back onto the Agenda	2	PS	G3	Medium Term
B4	A special initiative will be required to put together the approach to key inputs for the microdata, notably package prices, payments on behalf of tourists by tour operators etc. Again this needs to be on the agenda of the Working Group.	1	PS US	G3	Short-term
C) Improving data and metadata dissemination					
C1	Publish the national data when it becomes available in Eurostat databases prior to incorporation in European aggregates	3	US	G3	Short-term
C2	Extend the conferences/ seminars to a wider audience in Europe to enhance the understanding of tourism statistics methodologies by European stakeholders	2	US	G3	Medium-term

ID	Direction of Improvement/ Recommendation	Priority	Source	Owner	Timing
C3	Review accessibility/metadata/ ease of use on the Tourism Main Tables on the Website	1	US	G3	Short-term
D) Improvement in data quality					
D1	Continue the good work on definitions, harmonisation, thresholds, timeliness and completeness	1	CL US	G3	Ongoing
D2	Continue the plans for giving the validation tools (EBB) directly to Member States for micro-data transmission	1	CL	G3	Ongoing

Priority: 1 is highest priority, 3 lowest

Source: CL (checklist); US (Users' survey); PS (Partners' survey)

Owner: Unit G3 Short-term statistic; tourism

Timing: short-term (within the next 6 months), medium-term (within the next 2 years), long-term (needs more than 2 years for implementation)