

**BENCHMARKING AND INNOVATION STATISTICS**  
**- THIRTEENTH EEA WORKING PARTY MEETING -**

**Luxembourg, 19-20 September 2002**  
**Bech building, room Ampère**  
**Starting at 9.30 a.m.**

**SHORT MINUTES**

## SHORT MINUTES

### I- BENCHMARKING OF NATIONAL RESEARCH POLICIES

#### **Item 1: Adoption of the agenda**

The agenda was approved.

#### **Item 2: Adoption of the minutes of the 12th EEA WPM – 26-28 November 2001**

The minutes were adopted

#### **Item 3.1: Report on progress by Eurostat**

Eurostat informed the WPM about the progress of work on benchmarking in 2002 – mainly data collection, data processing and the development of the new and existing benchmarking indicators. Furthermore, the future plans regarding the benchmarking work were briefly described. Subject to the main users' needs a data collection will probably take place in the first half of 2003. All the Associated Countries will be included. *The main findings from the second benchmarking data collection will be incorporated into Newcronos and published in the coming weeks in a Statistics in Focus by Eurostat and in the edition 2002 of the “Key Figures” by DG Research.* Eurostat will include all countries participating in this data collection in the SIF publication, namely all EU Member states, US, Japan, Norway, Czech Republic and Iceland.

#### **Item 3.2: Report on progress by DG-Research**

DG-Research reported on the work undertaken in the High-Level Group, in the Expert Groups and in DG-Research on benchmarking. The five Expert Groups have now finalised their reports, and these reports can be found at <http://www.cordis.lu/rtd2002/era-developments/benchmarking.htm#results>. Information on the coming work and the second benchmarking cycle was also given. A series of workshops will take place this autumn and early 2003, and in particular, one workshop will be devoted to the benchmarking indicators (spring 2003). Furthermore, a major conference on the results of the first benchmarking cycle will be held in Athens in January 2003 which will include a session on indicators. A new Key Figures on the benchmarking and other indicators will be published in November. Data for the EFTA-countries will not be included in the analyses together with the other countries, but in a separate chapter.

*DG Research is envisaging the continuation of the benchmarking indicators, likely on the format of an annual scoreboard, that will continue in the current directions concerning the indicators.* The WP welcomed this and draw the attention of the users on the fact that a statistical information system has to be build over the time.

#### **Item 4: Second benchmarking data collection. Results and experiences – data quality and methodological issues**

Eurostat presented experiences from the data collection regarding data quality, data availability and comparability of the indicators provided by the Member States. Particularly, indicators where definitions have changed or where comparability ought to be improved were examined. Furthermore, some recommendations on future data collections were given, and the importance of co-ordination and co-operation was stressed.

#### **Item 5.1: Report on work by the Task Force on Benchmarking Indicators**

Eurostat presented the work conducted by the Task Force on Benchmarking Indicators. The Task Force met in Luxembourg 12 March 2002, and definitions for the two new human resources indicators (young and foreign researchers) have been prepared and discussed.

#### **Item 5.2 National experience with data collection on the new indicators on human resources in R&D**

##### **Item 5.2.1 Researchers by age and by nationality- The French Experience**

France presented its current data collection and analyses concerning foreign and young researchers. Regarding young researchers, France collects the birth date of the researchers, which make analyses of the age structure of researchers possible. Foreign researchers are measured as researchers in headcount with a non-national citizenship. A rather detailed breakdown of foreign researchers on regions is available from 2002.

##### **Item 5.2.2 Young Researchers- The Italian Experience**

The presentation from Italy showed that data on age have been collected for a long time in the Government sector, by age groups, but are usually not analysed and therefore not published. Beginning next year, age groups will be in line with the Frascati Manual guidelines making data comparable with other countries.

##### **Item 5.2.3 General Overview in of the Status of the new indicators in the Member states**

The presentation showed that, beside the French and Italian experiences, some data were available in Portugal, Denmark, Switzerland and Slovenia. Norway stated that data on age are available in Norway as well, and Estonia said that information on foreign researchers will be collected soon. The related document will be updated accordingly.

#### **Item 5.3: Proposal for definitions on "young" and "foreign" researchers to the Working Group Delegates**

Eurostat presented the proposals concerning "young" and "foreign" researchers, which was the result of the work of the Task Force on the benchmarking indicators. *It was agreed that a young researcher is a researcher below 35 years old, and a majority supported the suggested breakdowns by age groups according to the Frascati manual and by sex. It was*

*also agreed that foreign researchers should be defined according to the citizenship at the time of the survey.* However, the further breakdown by region of origin need some more work, as it was not considered to be detailed enough to satisfy the users' needs. The TF should be in charge of defining a further breakdown on regions. It was stated that indicators on age and citizenship are rather structural and do not change so rapidly, and accordingly the periodicity of data collected should be evaluated further. *The WP agreed on the definitions proposed and that a first collection of data can be launched although data are not available for all countries.*

#### **Item 5.4 Spin-offs Presentation of the work on the development of the spin-off indicator**

The presentation showed experience gained about methodology and main problems of comparability. A possible definition of spin-offs was presented, currently developed at OECD. It was confirmed that there is no common definition or methodology on spin-offs at present and that the figures collected are of limited significance due to low numbers and large variations from year to year. Delegates mainly pointed out that this indicator was not available on a short-term basis. *The decision was that the Task Force should work on a possible alternative to this indicator and continue to follow the work carried out in the OECD on spin-offs.*

#### **Item 6. Further Developments of the indicators**

##### **Item 6.1.1 Comments from the MS**

Comments from countries collected on the “third column” were presented. These comments showed that many of the proposed developments or breakdowns are already available. However, some of these proposed developments are not relevant, not possible to collect or need further methodological work.

##### **Item 6.1.2 Selection of 8 of the 20 indicators for further development**

DG Research proposed 9 indicators for the next stage, according to policy objectives of DG Research and feasibility:

1. Number of researchers
2. Number of new S&T PhDs
3. Total R&D in relation to GDP
4. R&D financed by industry
5. GBAORD
6. SMEs in publicly funded R&D
7. Employment and value added in high-tech and medium-high-tech industries
8. Employment and value added knowledge intensive services
9. Technology Balance of Payments

Eurostat provided a brief overview on each proposed indicator, its political meaning and the statistical feasibility. *This list of proposed indicators will be presented to HLG for approval.*

## **Item 6.2: Statistics on PhDs**

Eurostat informed the WPM about the methodology used in the Education statistics for collecting data on new PhDs. The ISCED classification and the boundary between ISCED levels 5 and 6 were examined in more detail. The national practises on what to include in the level 6 (PhDs) varied, and *the recommendation from Eurostat is to respect the ISCED classification in order to have comparable, national figures on new PhDs.*

## **Item 6.4 Technology balance of payments – data sources and methodology**

The OECD presented their work on TBP with a focus on data availability and sources and comparability. Central banks are the main data source for TBP, and hence the co-ordination and co-operation between central banks and the national institutions providing S&T data in general, ought to be improved. *The OECD agreed on sending their list of contact persons and instructions regarding TBP-statistics to Eurostat for dissemination to the WPM-delegates.*

## **Item 7: Benchmarking in the Associated Countries. Plans for the inclusion of the Associated Countries in the second benchmarking exercise. Roundtable on the status in the Associated countries**

All the Associated countries will be invited to participate in the next benchmarking cycle and consequently the next data collection on the indicators. *The roundtable revealed that all of the Associated Countries would like to participate in the next data collection* – with the possible exception of Israel. Although this group of countries is rather heterogeneous with respect to data availability, most of the countries reported that they would not face any large problems regarding data to be reported. However, the exceptions were the TBP and the venture capital indicators. Data on these indicators are not developed in many of the Candidate Countries. Also data on the patents and bibliometrics could cause problems, as these data are mainly based on other private data sources.

## **II- LEGAL BASIS**

### **Item 8 : Legal Basis for S&T statistics**

Eurostat informed the Member states about the latest developments at the European Parliament and at the Council on the ongoing process of adoption of the Council/European Parliament Decision concerning the production and development of Community S&T statistics.

Eurostat presented a revised version of the implementing tool (Draft Commission Decision) which specifies the variables to be delivered by the Member states as well as the areas for further development. This version needs still to be discussed with the interested Commission services. Member states were in general in favour to the proposed document. *Eurostat has asked the Member states to send their written comments by 15<sup>th</sup> October. Eurostat will then work out a new version to be discussed in the next WPM in November.*

### III- INNOVATION STATISTICS

#### Item 9 : Community Innovation Survey (CIS3)

*Eurostat reminded the MS who have signed grant agreements with the Commission that they have to respect the deadlines and submit their interim reports as soon as possible.* So far only 4 Member states have provided Eurostat with their interim reports. Eurostat is also urgently awaiting data from the MS.

Eurostat informed that the CALMAR macro for calibration due to high level of non-response could be downloaded electronically from INSEE web page (<http://www.insee.fr/fr/ppp/macro/macro.htm>). An English documentation of the CALMAR macro was provided at the meeting.

#### Item 9.1 Feedback on CIS3

Eurostat informed about the latest feedback on CIS3. All Member states, except Greece, had provided updated information.

Main problems were:

- low response rates
- high item non-response for some metric variables
- measurement of technological innovations in the service sector and in SMEs.

Eurostat stated that the MS are not bound to use the SAS software developed by Eurostat. However, problems faced by the Member states in the CIS3 data processing could be sent to Eurostat (Ibrahim Laafia or Anna Larsson).

*Eurostat will provide within the coming weeks the MS with general recommendations on how to deal with the reported problem on the estimation/imputation process when facing high non-response in specific stratum.* The new contractor on CIS3 data processing and data validation, GE-systems, was introduced.

Eurostat pointed out that the next steps in the CIS will be decided when the third round of the survey is finalised. Eurostat said that an evaluation of CIS3 is needed and in this respect all information provided by the MS in the interim and the final reports are of highly importance. Next year there will be a CEIES seminar devoted to innovation statistics in Athens (10/11 April) and the revision of the Oslo manual will begin in collaboration with the OECD. Eurostat pointed out that the evaluation of CIS3 by the Member states is of importance in this revision process of the Oslo manual. Member states information about CIS3, method and feedback will be put on CIRCA.

## **Item 9.2 Data validation and processing. Plans for dissemination**

Eurostat gave information about the data validation and processing so far and highlighted the faced problems. Data have been delivered from Finland, Ireland, Germany and Sweden.

*Eurostat will make quick publishing of the CIS3 results.* A Statistics in Focus (SiF) is already scheduled to the end of the year presenting data from the first CIS3 data providers, 4 to 5 Member states. More SiFs will be published later on completing CIS3 results from the rest of the Member states. Eurostat will pre-inform the WP delegates on the exact date of publication of the first SiF allowing interested countries to deliver their data in time. Some Member states showed an eager interest to have their data published in this first SiF.

## **Item 9.3 Access to confidential data for scientific purposes. Implementation of the regulation of confidentiality**

A new Commission Regulation No 831/2002 concerning access for researchers to confidential data has been adopted. CIS3 is concerned by this new Regulation and due to this Eurostat presented three different technical alternatives to anonymise the CIS3 micro-data: the approach used in the CVTS, microaggregation or a combination of these two techniques. The MS were positive to the set up of a Safe Centre at Eurostat premises where researchers can work directly with the confidential data. Some MS were in favour of microaggregation. *For the next WPM in November Sweden, Finland, Denmark and Italy volunteered to prepare a joint document with an anonymisation proposal that fits both small and big countries. Germany also showed an interest to contribute to this common work.*