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Part 1

Monitoring the implementation of social protection for all: comments on Version 0 of the monitoring framework
General assessment

• EPSR monitoring much welcomed;

• Consideration of context indicators (labour market related) much appreciated;

• First data published confirm the correctness of TU’s view -> a huge share of workers and self-employed is confronted with a reality which falls far behind EPSR goals;

• More monitoring attention has to be paid to effective and adequate coverage;

• Monitoring for all forms of employment needed, including standard employment.
Formal coverage

Indicators listed in Version 0

• Number of non-standard employment contracts lacking formal coverage, by social protection branch
• Number of non-standard employment contracts which are part of a voluntary social protection scheme, by social protection branch
• Number of self-employed contracts lacking formal coverage, by social protection branch
• Number of self-employed contracts which are part of a voluntary social protection scheme, by social protection branch

Comment

• Monitoring of formal coverage of standard workers is missing (of relevance especially in supplementary schemes)
• Specific attention has to be paid to qualifying conditions and length of period of access
Effective coverage

Indicators listed in version 0

• Benefit recipiency rate ("receiving any benefit") for the population at risk of poverty before social transfers
• Coverage of unemployment benefits for the short-term unemployed

Comment

• "Receiving any benefit" gives very little valuable indication on effective coverage (not ‘effective’ if only minuscule benefits are granted)
• "Receiving any benefit" does not allow a link to a specific branch of social protection
• Why limiting the monitoring to those ‘at risk of poverty’? (not only those at risk of poverty are addressed by ESPR and can experience unmet needs of social protection)
• Existing indicators, such as pension coverage rate among persons aged 65+, should also be used
• Additional use of administrative data recommended (as suggested in Version 0)
Adequacy

Indicators listed in Version 0

• Material and social deprivation rate (by most frequent activity status during reference year)
• Poverty rate after social transfers (by most frequent activity status during reference year)
• Impact of social transfers, excl. pensions (by most frequent activity status during reference year)
• Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap (by most frequent activity status during reference years)

Note: All these indicators are based on household income -> it is pooled together and the equivalised

Comment

• Only to use poverty related indicators falls far behind EPSR objectives (Version 0 is aware of this shortcoming: “The list should be complemented by other indicators reflecting the income-smoothing function of social protection“)

• A look at OECD‘s pension (theoretical) replacement rate calculations show that, in many countries, even standard workers with a full career are not entitled to adequate old-age pensions
PENSION PROSPECTS OF TODAY’S YOUTH (Theoretical) Replacement Rate Calculations – Mandatory Pension Schemes

Main assumptions: Labour market entry 2018 at age 22; uninterrupted career until legal pension age; constant earnings at average earnings level; no future change of pension formula

* Values for men (different retirement age for women)

Source: OECD 2019

Graphic: AK Wien
Employed – Disaggregated by labour market status
EU27/ Age group: 15-74 / 2019

- Employee (full-time, permanent) ........................................... 59.5%
- Employee (full-time, temporary) ............................................. 8.9%
- Employee (part-time, permanent) .......................................... 12.7%
- Employee (part-time, temporary) .......................................... 3.8%
- Self-employed (with employees) ............................................ 4.3%
- Self-employed (without employees) ........................................ 9.8%
- Family workers .................................................................... 1.0%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context indicators Labour market related</th>
<th>EU 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of full-time permanent employees</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of employees with a short term contract (up to 3 months/ 6 months / 1 year)</td>
<td>2.3% → up to 3 months 8.1% → up to 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of employees by duration of employment with current employer</td>
<td>11.9% → up to 1 year 43.7% → 10 years and over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of employed persons who work less than 10 hours a week</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of low wage earners among all employees</td>
<td>15.3% → permanent contract 31.9% → limited duration contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of dependent self-employed</td>
<td>2.8% of self-employed 806.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key requirements

• Disaggregation of data by sex and age groups / focus on working age
• Additional use of administrative data
• For detecting and monitoring marginal part-time employment a higher limit than ‘less than 10 hours’ is needed
• Collective bargaining coverage should be included in labour market monitoring
• Specific monitoring of the phenomenon of false self-employment is needed (for example in the context of platform work)
• Jobless people not recorded as unemployed but ‘discouraged’ or ‘seeking but not immediately available’ should be included in monitoring unemployment
• The negative impact of precarious forms of employment on social protection (both on the protection of those concerned and the overall financing of social protection systems) should be highlighted
• Improving employment integration throughout working age has to be one of the cornerstones of a strategy of implementing EPSR goals
Part 2

Enlarging EU social and economic indicators: a workers’ narrative
Same indicators, different narrative

• Same statistics and different narrative
• Additional statistics and different narrative
• Plethora of social and economic indicators, dashboards, and flagship reports: let us use them
• The advantage of the synthesis indexes
• But the devil is in the detail
• In search of missing dimensions
• Own dashboards or use of common official dashboards
• Indicators and targets; indicators become normative
• Value added of our own reading and narrative
EU social monitoring may be defined as a systematic and continuous observation of social protection/rights in the EU and related changes across time;

The purpose of monitoring is to identify whether we are on the right track to where we want to be.

Mostly by making use of quantitative measurement instruments, e.g. indicator systems, indicator dashboards;

It seems appropriate to distinguish between data-driven, policy-driven, and needs-driven approaches towards monitoring;

While policy-driven approaches usually depart from policy concerns and objectives, which have been agreed upon in political discourses or decision making processes, data-driven approaches usually turn out to be rather pragmatic, departing simply from available data sources.

A needs-driven approach from a workers’ perspective depart from the concerns and objective workers and their representatives have.
Context: EU social indicators

• When discussing ‘monitoring’, one sometimes gets the impression that this can only be done with numbers and quantitative indicators;
• Monitoring relying solely on quantitative indicators might give the impression that if there is not a number, nothing is happening;
• With qualitative questions (e.g. by asking open-ended questions to ‘beneficiaries’), one can complement quantitative indicators and get a richer understanding of whether or not the intended results are starting to be observed;
• Social benefits rights data: quantitative indicators are based on the collection and processing of qualitative text-based information from the legislative framework. Analysis of the generosity of social benefits by analysing the eligibility criteria (i.e. reference group – personal scope), the entitlement conditions (i.e. waiting period, qualifying period, the duration of the benefit), targeted or universal, means tested, and the level of benefits.
• This will hopefully also give a better and more complete picture of reality;
• Concerns about the adequacy of indicators as well as data availability.
Monitoring the transnational dimension of social protection

- Gaps in transnational social protection, both in terms of protecting social security rights and working conditions of intra-EU mobile persons (EU-movers, posted workers, seasonal workers, frontier workers …);
- Movements between Member States should not lead to lower social protection or gaps in coverage;
- Legal framework is difficult to convert into quantitative indicators;
- Useful to evaluate and improve transnational social protection policies.
The benefit of synthesis indicators: the example of ‘EUSDG8 Decent work and Economic growth Index 2010 and 2019’

Marco Cilento, SDG8 Index to monitor the progress of each European country over time, Presentation ETUC 4 March 2021
Euro Health Consumer Index 2018 (Health Consumer Powerhouse)

Euro Health Consumer Index 2018 (Health Consumer Powerhouse)

• The Green countries on the map on the front cover are scoring >750 on the 1000-point scale. Red are countries scoring <650.

### Euro Health Consumer Index 2018 (Health Consumer Powerhouse): a dashboard for upward convergence

![Table Image](https://healthpowerhouse.com/media/EHCI-2018/EHCI-2018-report.pdf)
An affluent list of dashboards

• MIP Macro-economic imbalances procedure Core indicators and supplementary indicators

• Employment Performance Monitor (EPM)

• Social Protection Performance Monitor (SPPM)
  • Used to guide country specific recommendations in the social protection area)

• Europe 2020 Joint Assessment Framework (JAF).
  • The JAF is an indicator-based assessment system prepared jointly by the Employment Committee, the Social Protection Committee (SPC) and the Commission

• ESPR European Pillar of Social Rights dashboard from 2018 on
Flagship Reports

• 2021 Ageing Report
• 2021 Pension Adequacy Report
• 2021 Report on long-term care
• Yearly report ESDE Employment and Social Development Report in Europe
Social progress

- Social indicators added in 2015 to the MIP
- Dashboard EPSR included in social semester
- Social dimension more present in CSR, from restrictive to expansion of social protection
- Room for flexibility and fiscal stance
- In 2020, 2021 and perhaps 2020 activation of the general escape clause of the stability and growth pact
- And a discussion on the reform of this SGP is announced, allowing in the future probably more debt financed public investments
- A fiscal response package of Next Generation EU of 750 billion euro is approved of which 672,5 billion for the Recovery and resilience fund, of which 312,5 billion as grants; for the period 2021-2026; total is 5,4% of GDP EU 27, or yearly 0,9 % of GDP (some 13 870 billion in EU 27)
- But recovery and stability needs to come from national policies, including social protection (some 3 604 billion in EU, in one year, some 26% of GDP)
From social retrenchment to social protection in the country: Specific recommendations CSR

Fig. 1 The internal composition of the Semester’s social recommendations. Source: Authors’ own elaboration. Note: percentage of policy prescriptions by ‘orientation’ over the total of social recommendations.
An alternative (workers?) reading of the Ageing report: what future sustainability also means (example for Belgium, 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AWG 2015 (2013 prices)</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2060 Index 2060</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDP in billion euro</td>
<td></td>
<td>381</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (millions)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,2</td>
<td>11,9</td>
<td>15,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita in euro</td>
<td></td>
<td>34 054</td>
<td>35 000</td>
<td>56 552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population +65 (million)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>2,2</td>
<td>3,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in % of total population</td>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita in prices 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>34 054</td>
<td>35 000</td>
<td>56 552</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Real implications behind public cost of ageing as % of GDP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AWG 2015 (2013 prices)</th>
<th>index 2060</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita in euro</td>
<td>34.054</td>
<td>35.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care as % of GDP</td>
<td>6,0</td>
<td>5,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term care as % of GDP</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total health + LTC as % of GDP</td>
<td>8,1</td>
<td>8,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care per capita in euro</td>
<td>2.043</td>
<td>2.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTC per capita in euro</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total health + LTC in euro</td>
<td>2.758</td>
<td>2.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP- health and LTC, per capita, in euro</td>
<td>31.295</td>
<td>32.130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Real implications behind public cost of ageing as % of GDP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AWG 2015 (2013 prix)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita in euro</td>
<td>34.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensions as % of GDP</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensions + health + LTC as % of GDP</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensions in euro per capita</td>
<td>4.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensions + health + LTC per capita in euro</td>
<td>6.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP - pensions – health – LTC, per capita</td>
<td>27.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons above 65 as % of total population</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ageing cost of 65+ in euro per capita</td>
<td>5.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ageing cost in euro per person above 65</td>
<td>32.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of GDP per capita</td>
<td>28.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of GDP per person below 65</td>
<td>34.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio evolution resources +65/65-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 3

Adequate pensions for ageing in dignity

3.1 First and second pension pillars
3.2 Affordable health and LTC
3.1 First and second pension pillars

Assessment of adequacy (PAR 2018)
Parameters for an adequate and sustainable (PAYG Pay-As-You-Go) pension scheme

- Income of the pension scheme, pension contributions = A(t) x c(t) x W(t)
- =
- pension expenditures = B(t) x P(t) = B(t) x r(t) x W(t)
- where
  - A is number of employed or potentially employed persons,
  - c is contribution rate,
  - W (t) is average wage and
  - B(t) is number of beneficiaries or retirees
  - P(t) is average pension
- r is the replacement rate or r(t) = P(t) / W(t)
- c is the contribution rate or c = (B(t) * P(t)) / (W(t) * A(t))
  - or c(t) = (B(t) / A(t)) * (P(t) / W(t))
- where
  - B(t) / A(t) = dependency rate
  - and
  - P(t) / W(t) = replacement rate.

Source: based on Devolder, P., & de Valeriola, S. University of Louvain (UCL) Belgium, May 2016, *Pension Design and Risk Sharing: New Mix Solutions between DB and DC, Institute and Faculty of Actuaries*, PowerPoint;
Role of the first and second pillar pension pillar: in contributions

Employers' actual pension contributions

Source: J. Pacolet, L. De Smedt, F. De Wispelaere, 2021 on Table 29 National Accounts, Eurostat
Role of the first and second pension pillar: in contributions

Employers' imputed pension contributions

Source: J. Pacolet, L. De Smedt, F. De Wispelaere, 2021 on Table 29 National Accounts, Eurostat
Role of the first and second pension pillar: in contributions

Households' actual pension contributions

- Private defined contribution schemes
- Private defined benefit schemes
- Defined benefit schemes for general government employees classified in financial corporations
- Defined benefit schemes for general government employees classified in general government (not in core accounts)
- Social security pension schemes (not in core accounts)

Source: J. Pacolet, L. De Smedt, F. De Wispelaere, 2021 on Table 29 National Accounts, Eurostat
Role of the first and second pension pillar: total contributions, as % GDP

Source: J. Pacolet, L. De Smedt, F. De Wispelaere, 2021 on Table 29 National Accounts, Eurostat
Role of the first and second pension pillar: in benefits

Social insurance pension benefits

% of GDP

BE  BG  CZ  DK  DE  EE  ES  FR  HR  IT  CY  LV  LT  LU  HU  MT  NL  AT  PL  PT  RO  SI  SK  FI  SE  IS  NO  CH  UK  EU

Private pension schemes

Defined benefit schemes for general government employees classified in financial corporations

Defined benefit schemes for general government employees classified in general government (not in core accounts)

Social security pension schemes (not in core accounts)

Source: J. Pacolet, L. De Smedt, F. De Wispelaere, 2021 on Table 29 National Accounts, Eurostat
Role of the first and second pension pillar: administrative costs

Pension insurance scheme service charges

- Defined benefit schemes for general government employees classified in general government (core accounts)
- Defined contribution schemes of general government (core accounts)
- Defined benefit schemes for general government employees classified in financial corporations
- Private pension schemes

Source: J. Pacolet, L. De Smedt, F. De Wispelaere, 2021 on Table 29 National Accounts, Eurostat
Role of the first and second pension pillar: administrative costs

‘A front-load fee (% of new contributions) of 1% would reduce the value of contributions after a 40 years career with some 20%; an annual management fee (% of account balance) of 0.5% would reduce the value of the account after 40 years with some 10.5%. Peter Diamond (2018), https://saspensions.files.wordpress.com/2018/11/peter-diamond.pdf

Source: J. Pacolet, L. De Smedt, F. De Wispelaere, 2021 on Table 29 National Accounts, Eurostat
Role of the first and second pension pillar: accrued-to-date pension entitlements

Pension entitlements in closing balance sheet

Source: J. Pacolet, L. De Smedt, F. De Wispelaere, 2021 on Table 29 National Accounts, Eurostat
Role of the second pension pillar: accrued-to-date pension entitlements

Pension entitlements in closing balance sheet, 2018

Source: J. Pacolet, L. De Smedt, F. De Wispelaere, 2021 on Table 29 National Accounts, Eurostat
### Gross and net replacement rate, mandatory public and private pensions, and voluntary private schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Gross mandatory public and private</th>
<th>Net mandatory public and private</th>
<th>Total gross with voluntary</th>
<th>Total net with voluntary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>76,5 / 76,5 / 76,5</td>
<td>0,5 / 1 / 1,5</td>
<td>0,5 / 1 / 1,5</td>
<td>0,5 / 1 / 1,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>57,3 / 46,8 / 33,7</td>
<td>70,7 / 66,2 / 48,3</td>
<td>78,1 / 61,0 / 44,1</td>
<td>87,9 / 72,4 / 57,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>75,0 / 45,9 / 36,2</td>
<td>91,6 / 60,3 / 47,9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>113,8 / 74,4 / 64,0</td>
<td>104,5 / 70,9 / 63,3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>61,4 / 47,1 / 42,3</td>
<td>65,6 / 53,1 / 49,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>56,5 / 56,5 / 56,5</td>
<td>65,1 / 64,2 / 64,9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>60,2 / 60,1 / 54,0</td>
<td>71,4 / 73,6 / 69,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>38,7 / 38,7 / 38,7</td>
<td>56,1 / 51,9 / 51,4</td>
<td>52,2 / 52,2 / 52,2</td>
<td>68,6 / 68,0 / 67,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>63,1 / 49,9 / 45,5</td>
<td>57,6 / 51,1 / 50,3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>56,1 / 56,1 / 56,1</td>
<td>84,3 / 84,3 / 84,3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>54,1 / 27,0 / 18,0</td>
<td>60,5 / 35,9 / 26,7</td>
<td>89,9 / 62,9 / 53,8</td>
<td>105,6 / 81,1 / 75,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>79,5 / 79,5 / 79,5</td>
<td>92,0 / 91,8 / 94,4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>44,6 / 44,6 / 44,6</td>
<td>55,2 / 54,3 / 52,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>36,8 / 23,6 / 19,2</td>
<td>48,4 / 31,0 / 25,3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>91,5 / 78,8 / 74,5</td>
<td>99,0 / 90,1 / 85,9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>73,5 / 70,9 / 70,1</td>
<td>78,0 / 80,2 / 78,5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>29,4 / 29,4 / 29,4</td>
<td>35,9 / 35,1 / 34,7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>75,8 / 74,4 / 73,1</td>
<td>88,0 / 89,6 / 89,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>59,5 / 49,6 / 47,0</td>
<td>71,7 / 65,1 / 63,3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>47,8 / 38,8 / 36,0</td>
<td>62,8 / 57,5 / 53,7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>72,3 / 72,3 / 72,3</td>
<td>78,6 / 83,4 / 82,8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>54,1 / 54,1 / 65,3</td>
<td>60,7 / 53,4 / 68,9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>43,5 / 21,7 / 14,5</td>
<td>51,0 / 28,4 / 20,2</td>
<td>72,6 / 50,9 / 37,4</td>
<td>82,3 / 61,0 / 47,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU28</td>
<td>60,3 / 52,0 / 48,8</td>
<td>69,8 / 63,5 / 60,4</td>
<td>73,6 / 67,0 / 64,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OECD, Pensions at a glance 2019; see also B. Davies, ETUC report 2021
Fiscal treatment of contributions and benefits: role of fiscal expenditures

- Difference between gross and net pensions
- Importance of fiscal and social expenditures
- Is similar for total social protection
- An example for Belgium: the taxation of benefits was some 2% of GDP; the fiscal expenditures for social protection was also some 2% of GDP

Pacolet, 2019 and PAR, 2021
Total assets in retirement savings plans, as % of GDP, 2009 vs 2019

Source: OECD
3.2 Adequate (available, affordable) and sustainable health and LTC
Private and public spending on healthcare, % of GDP, 2017

Source: Eurostat data, SHA
Private and public spending on healthcare, old member states, % of GDP, 2007-2018

Bismarck-oriented

Government schemes and compulsory contributory health care financing schemes
Voluntary health care payment schemes
Household out-of-pocket payment

Beveridge-oriented

Source: Eurostat data
Private and public spending on healthcare, new Member States, as % of GDP, 2007-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>HU</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>SK</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>LV</th>
<th>LT</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>CY</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>BG</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>HR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>5.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Eurostat data
**Long-term care (LTC) spending, % of GDP, projections**

Source: 2018 Ageing report
LTC: % of beneficiaries of total population and total spending as % of GDP

Source: 2018 Ageing report
Relation between development of residential and home care

![Graph showing the relation between the percentage of the population receiving institutional care and the percentage receiving home care across different countries.](image)

Source: 2018 Ageing report
In search of the expenditures on health and long-term care in the ESSPROS statistics on social protection, EU 28, as % of GDP
In search of the expenditures on health and long-term care in the ESSPROS statistics on social protection
In search of the expenditures on health and long-term care in the ESSPROS statistics on social protection

Cash benefits - expenditure social protection in % of GDP
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Complementarity between in cash and in kind benefits, total of health, sickness, disability, old age and survivors
Complementarity between in cash and in kind benefits by function
LTC: public and private spending for health long-term care social long-term care as % of GDP

Source: Eurostat SHA

56
LTC: relative importance of the in SHA reported social long-term care, as % of total health care and social long-term care

You never know if zero means not existing or not reported or included in health care; You neither know if figures for other countries are exhaustive

Share HC R 1 in total health care expenditure including HC R 1

Source: Eurostat SHA
LTC: public and private spending for residential health long-term care as % of GDP

Source: Eurostat SHA
Some conclusions

• Indicators are not targets
• We should take stock of what is available
• It is not only about sustainability and adequacy, but also about transparency and exhaustiveness
• There is no free lunch for social protection
• It takes time before substantial changes occur
• See first of all the conclusions on monitoring the recommendation for decent social protection
• We added somewhat to the transparency on pensions
• Adequacy is multidimensional: improvement is needed as well on the dimension of poverty avoidance, and improved replacement: take the momentum for the need to recovery, to improve the systems now, as part of the expansion policy
• Health and long-term care are by definition in kind. From European comparative perspective we should develop them further in those countries lagging behind
• For long-term care, financed or organized explicitly or implicitly, both at home, in residential setting and as care allowance, they all need to be further developed.
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