Summary Table of Peer Country Comments

	Situation in the peer country relative to the host country	Assessment of the policy measure	Assessment of success factors and transferability	Questions to the host country
Finland	• Social protection system is divided into social security and social welfare. Social security is mainly granted by the state and social welfare services are in the responsibility of municipalities. • Social assistance is a legally regulated right of citizens. In the legislation, there are regulations on eligibility for social assistance, timetable of decision making of granting social assistance and amount of basic social assistance. • Since 2017, the administration of basic social assistance has been the duty of the Social Insurance Institution (KELA), while municipalities are still responsible for granting supplementary and preventive social assistance.	• Similar feature in Finland is that citizens and public officials need to use various databases. Different kind of user rights make receiving data about clients difficult at the organisational level and especially in the context of multisectoral work. • There is no system in Finland similar to SPIS in Lithuania. There have been efforts to develop such a system for private and public service providers and citizens, e.g. Kanta-service in health care (developed in 2010-2016) and Kanta service for Social care (developed in 2016-2022). • In both countries the aim is to ensure equal provision of social security to citizens. Due to differences in granting social assistance in the municipalities, granting of basic social assistance was transferred to KELA. • In Finland, collection and delivery of statistical information about social security and social services is regulated by law. The Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, KELA, THL and Statistics of Finland have all roles in collecting information and maintaining the data system of social assistance. • Digitalisation of public services has been promoted via governmental programs, projects and new	• A success factor of SPIS is the systematic development of it, making partnership agreements and showing benefits of system to municipalities and citizens. Features that make use of SPIS easier, such as calculators and guiding videos, are positively reflected in the number of users. Future plans of developing SPIS to combine other data systems with it and to use E-file will improve the usability of SPIS. • In Finland there's ongoing enhancement of digitalisation of public service and reform of health, social services and regional government. These require unified data systems and thus would benefit greatly from transferring a system such as SPIS to Finland. eHealth and eSocial Strategy 2020 and development programs as STEPS 2.0 will help the implementation of digitalisation in social services. • For possibilities to use data of people in social services and receiving social assistance, the new act on the secondary use of health and social data will bring improvements.	• Where did the idea originate and what was the incentive for that kind of solution? (e.g. political decision, technical advice) • Are there any other measures in Lithuania such as the videos in SPIS which aim at enhancing the use of SPIS when applying for social support? • Are there any strategies and policy programmes that supported the launching data system such as the SPIS?

Peer Review on "Social Protection Information System", Vilnius, Lithuania, 23 November 2017

Summary Table of Peer Country Comments

	Situation in the peer country relative to the host country	Assessment of the policy measure	Assessment of success factors and transferability	Questions to the host country
		legislation. Digitalisation and using digital service is more common in Finland.		
Poland	• Much larger population • More people at risk of social exclusion • Similarity of organising the social protection systems • Similar ways of granting minimum income support • Much more agencies and actors involved in the benefit delivery	• Information system CSIZS, a measure similar to SPIS, is in use in Poland • CSIZS and SPIS differ in the origins, development paths and some functions • CSIZS objective (1): Support local officers in processing application forms via on-line information checks. <u>Results</u>: Time saving and better fraud detection • CSIZS objective (2): Establishment, handling and making accessible databases. <u>Results</u>: Central Database of Beneficiaries and its functionalities • CSIZS objective (3): Development of e-services for the individual users/applicants. <u>Results</u>: A specialized Internet portal and on-line communication/ forms accessible	• Involvement and strong position of the coordinating unit • Effective methods of setting up e-communication standards and data protection • Digital skills and the development of e-government • Transparency and clarity of the system and its good promotion • Different scopes of the systems could make transferability difficult	• Since there are a few objectives and functions of SPIS, which one has proved to be the most successful and useful? • Are there any problems noticed in the area of identification of the individual users? Is there a need to use other authentication keys and channels? • What solutions are proposed to handle documents in paper form currently attached to the (on line) application forms? • What could be improved in the cooperation of the SPIS with the Lithuanian Department of Statistics?
Slovenia	• As in most of the European countries, the Slovenian social protection system is divided into social security and social welfare. Systems based on compulsory social insurance are of crucial importance. Social assistance system is centralized, although	• Direct comparison is not possible because the Slovenian system is very centralized and focused on cash benefits, Lithuanian system is decentralised and more comprehensive, focused both on services and cash benefits. • In both cases, relevant ministries relatively early envisaged potential	• Slovenia and Lithuania are relatively small countries, the question is if their approach in unification of IT support in the field of social assistance can be applied in bigger, regionally more diverse countries. • Comprehensive IT support in the field of social assistance can also be an important device in the process	• What are the plans for the simplification of the application procedure from the side of potential beneficiaries? • How is the present system used for analytical purposes and are there any plans to upgrade it in this regard?

Peer Review on "Social Protection Information System", Vilnius, Lithuania, 23 November 2017

Summary Table of Peer Country Comments

	Situation in the peer country relative to the host country	Assessment of the policy measure	Assessment of success factors and transferability	Questions to the host country
	municipalities have some responsibilities mainly in the provision of care services. • Poverty rate and social exclusion rate are relatively low, due to well-targeted benefits. • Most of the social benefits are means tested, they are granted through the network of social work centres based on strict legal foundation. • Since 2000 IT support for granting social benefits called IT SWC was gradually developed. Very important modifications related to the IT support were introduced through a reform in 2010. This task was performed by responsible ministries with the support of external IT providers.	benefits of IT-supported decision processes. Many similar benefits for users, decision makers, ministries, and other stakeholders were recognized. Due to IT support social assistance systems are more transparent, more efficient and user-friendly. They also provide important financial savings, at least in the case of Slovenia, in the decision-making procedure. • It is very important that regular evaluation of the system is conducted in both countries, accompanied by upgrades.	of alleviation of poverty, due to the fact that poverty is the multidimensional phenomenon which needs cross-cutting approach. It can enable better and more targeted collaboration of different stakeholders, but bearing in mind all the time that direct professional work and empowerment of users is crucial. • Lithuanian IT support is very much focused on potential beneficiaries which is not entirely the case in the Slovenian system. In this regard, some of the solutions can be useful for the future development of social assistance IT support system.	• As we understand from the host county paper, SPIS was predominantly developed to support different tasks in the field of social assistance. Are there any plans for better exchange of data with other fields of social security (employment offices, health care facilities)? • Are there any plans to monitor quality of decision-making and granting processes with the support of SPIS?