

QUALITY REPORT

ESSPROS PENSION BENEFICIARIES

(according to Commission Regulation (EC) No 1322/2007 of 12 November 2007, published in OJ L294, 13.11.2007, p.5)

MEMBER STATE: GREECE

REFERENCE YEAR: 2011

REPORT ISSUED: 31/06/2013

1. Accuracy and Reliability / Geographical coverage

1.1 Coverage of data sources (part 1)

Name of data source	Type of data source used (i.e. administrative data, survey, etc.) <i>(see regulation point 2.1.1)</i>	Frequency of data collection (of the data source) <i>(see regulation point 2.1.1)</i>	Timelag <i>(see regulation point 2.1.1)</i>	Schemes covered (please indicate which schemes are covered by this data source) <i>(see regulation point 2.1.1)</i>
Social Insurance Organizations (Funds) in private & public sector (Social Security funds)	Administrative	Annually	6 months	1,2
Private Insurance Enterprises (Occupational Insurance)	Administrative data	annually	6 months	7
Banks & Public Corporations (Employer statutory provided benefits)	Administrative data	annually	6 months	8
General Accounting Office (Other Government linked social provision)	Administrative data	annually	6 months	9

1.1 Coverage of data sources (part 2) – please note that part 1 and part 2 are in fact one table and have only been separated to facilitate the completion of the table

Name of data source	Any additional information regarding this data source (i.e. reports on problems (including delays) which lead to estimation of data) <i>Please indicate which schemes are concerned by this information</i> <i>(see regulation point 2.1.1)</i>	Geographical coverage (i.e. which parts of the country are covered by this data source) <i>Please indicate which schemes are concerned by this information</i> <i>(see regulation point 2.2)</i>
Source: Social Security Organizations (Funds) {Scheme 1 (Social Security funds) Scheme 2 (Civil servants' social Security funds)}	Greece is faced with problems when it comes to accountability of double counting on P.B., between schemes (1,2,7,8,9) for the same or different categories of pension. Such problems are: a. we cannot specifically point out such accountability of double counting since in Greece it does not exist an application of integrated technology system (I. T. solution) for the Social Security Funds. b. Lately Greece has developed a Social Security number (A.M.K.A) concerning every one individual person or/and pensioner given the large amount of existing funds, which was not applied fully yet to all security funds. For the above reasons we provided estimations.	Whole country
Source: Private Insurance Enterprises {Scheme 7. (Occupational Insurance)}	Same holds as above	Whole country

Source: Banks & Public Corporations { Scheme 8. (Employer statutory provided benefits)}	Same holds as above	Whole country
Source: General Accounting Office { Scheme 9. (Other Government linked social provision)}	Same holds as above	Whole country

1.2 Geographical comparability (see regulation point 2.2)

Degree of coverage in terms of schemes <i>(if there are cases of schemes, to be potentially included in ESSPROS that are completely or partially missed or not available)</i>	Degree of coverage in terms of beneficiaries <i>(whether for the schemes included that data provided are exhaustive or if a number of pension beneficiaries are not available (partial return))</i>	Cases of non-application of the ESSPROS methodology in the form of a comprehensive list <i>(whether there are cases (both schemes and benefits) of possible non-adherence with the ESSPROS methodology: provision from specific sources, for example, could imply the use of definitions and methodologies not in line with our Manual)</i>
There were no cases of schemes included in Esspros that are completely or partially missed or not available	In all schemes (1,2,7,8,9), there is a coverage in PB data of about 100%	Cases of possible non-adherence with the Esspros methodology: Greece does not provide figures on Pension Beneficiaries for the following categories (that differ from Esspros methodology due to their non existence): 1. Beneficiaries receiving early retirement benefits due to reduced capacity to work (1120112). This pension category does

		not exist in Greece 2. Partial pension beneficiaries (1130113). This pension category does not exist in Greece.
--	--	--

2. Methodologies and assumptions used in the treatment of double counting and in estimates *(please give details for relevant cases)*

2.1 Estimates for schemes on which no data are available

(see regulation point 2.1.2)

Scheme	Estimates for schemes on which no data are available <i>(please summarise estimation procedures)</i>
7 and 8	For scheme 7 we have collected data for about 80% of private Insurance companies and for scheme 8 there has been low response from Banks & Public Corporations and we provided estimations following past trends.

2.2 Information on the treatment of double counting *(please indicate all types of double counting occurring in your country and specify the treatment, if any, for each of these cases)* *(see regulation point 2.1.2)*

(a) for a pension category inside a single scheme *(please specify schemes concerned):*

Yet as far as scheme (1), double counting type one, we used a methodological factor such as a percentage charge (which is 4% for every beneficiary) participation factor imposed to all insured, for medical and other pharmaceutical products, thus we were able to account for double counting, given the large number of pension funds. (For every pensioner there is only one % charge participation factor imposed, from

only one main fund that he or she has. This is not imposed by two funds in case that a pensioner receives two pensions but only from one main fund. Thus every fund, in order to avoid double counting, counted only those pensioners who had a % charge participation factor imposed to them)

For scheme (2), we used as methodology a tax identification number in order to measure the double counted.

(b) between schemes (a pension category for all schemes):

1. Due to missing information, the treatment of double counting between schemes (double counting type two) was made only by eliminating the supplementary schemes (7, 8, 9) in the total. For such a reason each category can't show the effective number of beneficiaries.

2. No information is available for treating for double counting between the remaining schemes (1, 2), but the number of pensioners who receive a pension from both schemes is negligible.

(c) between non-means-tested and means-tested pension categories:

All pensioners who get a means tested benefit also get a non means tested benefit (double counting type 3.1), and in order to avoid double counting we counted them only once and they are all included in the non means tested category. We do not aggregate non-means and means-tested categories. The total of Non-means tested benefit is recorded to codes: 1120111, 1130111 and 1140111.

Exemption to the above is a very negligible number of pensioners that only get a means tested benefit and they are not included inside the non-means tested category. Specifically these negligible numbers of pensioners are included only in (means – tested) codes 1132 111 and 1142111 and continuously we aggregate them to the totals 1130111 and 1140111.

(d) between categories in aggregation:

1. As far as double counting in intra function aggregation, here in Greece such case does not exist since there are categories such as a) early retirement benefits due to reduced capacity to work when it comes to Disability function and partial pensions when it comes to Old age function
2. As far as double counting in inter function aggregation, (double counting type five) here we have treated for double counting between Old age, and disability by transferring the above legal retirement age pensioners towards old age, but according to Esspros methodology we did not do the same with the survivors pensioners.
3. Double counting (type six) in the total number of pensioners (code item 1000000), was treated by applying the following methodological factors such as: a. a percentage charge (which is 4% for every beneficiary-For every pensioner there is only one % charge participation factor imposed, from only one main fund that he or she has. This is not imposed by two funds in case that a pensioner receives two pensions but only from one main fund. Thus every fund, in order to avoid double counting, counted only those pensioners who had a % charge participation factor imposed to them) participation factor imposed to all insured for scheme 1, for medical and other pharmaceutical products, and b. a tax identification number for scheme 2, thus we were able to account for double counting and get the total estimate on pension beneficiaries.

3. Revision of statistics *(please only complete for relevant benefits and relevant columns)* *(see regulation point 2.1.3)*

Benefit	Changes in the data sources used	Changes in the methods used for estimating data	Revisions of data due to availability of final statistics	Revisions of data due to quality review actions
No revisions	No revisions	No revisions	No revisions	No revisions

4. Other information

--