_____

Fourteenth Meeting of the
IMF Committee on Balance of Payments Statistics
Tokyo, Japan, October 24-26, 2001

Report of the Chairman of the Technical Group on Travel
To the Balance of Payments Working Group

Prepared by Eurostat

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
EUROSTAT

Directorate B: Economic statistics and economic and monetary convergence
Unit B-5: International trade in services, direct investments, balance of payments

1 October 2001
BP/01/36/E

Working Group

Balance of Payments

15 - 16 October 2001

Quetelet Room, BECH Building
Kirchberg, Luxembourg

starting : 15 October at 10.00 a.m.
ending: 16 October at 5.00 p.m.

**Report of the Chairman of the Technical Group on Travel
to the Balance of Payments Working Group of 15-16 October 2001***

Report of the Chairman of the TG Travel
to the BOP WG of 15-16 October 2001

1. PROGRESS REPORT ON THE ACTIVITY OF THE GROUP

1. 1 Brief presentation of the activities of the group since the last BOP WP

The actions recently undertaken by the TGT followed the group mandate, consisting of two tasks: a) the monitoring of national plans for the revision of collection systems for Travel, in order to support the circulation of best practices; b) the continuation of the bilateral comparison exercises, in order to improve the quality of the data and reduce Travel asymmetries. In June 2001 a new consultation on national plans of EU MS and Candidate Countries for the collection of Travel data from 2002 onwards was launched. At the same time, the preparation of a further bilateral comparison exercise on Travel data among seven countries represented in the TGT was started. After a rather long pause (the previous meeting had been held in February 2000) a new meeting of the TGT was held in Luxembourg on 20-21 September 2001.

1.1.1 Consultation on national plans

This sub-paragraph highlights the main results of the written consultation concerning EU countries and the subsequent discussion in last TGT meeting. <u>More details can be found in the document attached as an annex "Consultation on national plans to collect Travel statistics from 2002 - Summary of the answers - EU countries"</u>. The analysis of the answers of Candidate Countries has been postponed (however, a summary document has been prepared for distribution to the BOP WG).

Answers received
Most countries provided a full response to the questionnaire. Partial exceptions are DK[1], that confirmed the answer provided in a previous occasion and PT, that for the time being was only able to indicate the general features of their future system. GR has not yet answered the questionnaire. Both PT and GR have promised to provide the group with updated information as soon as possible.

Characteristics of systems and state of implementation
The options expressed by the 14 MS which have answered to the consultation can be briefly summarised as follows (only main sources are considered):
- Six countries (AT, BE, FI, DE, LU, NL) will use a **hybrid system**, i.e. a system composed by a combination of several types of sources. The common feature of these systems is the use of <u>household surveys</u> as a source for the debit side. The sources used for the credit side vary from country to country: survey of tourist providers (BE, NL), bank reports and credit cards (AT), inbound frontier surveys (FI), estimates (DE, LU), partner country data (DE - vis-à-vis EMU countries), administrative sources (LU).
- Four countries (GB, IE, IT, ES) will adopt a **frontier survey based system**, i.e. based on inbound-outbound surveys at the borders;
- Two countries (DK, SE) will maintain for the time being the present system, essentially based on **bank reports and credit card data** (in SE complemented by partner country data and estimates). A switch to (hybrid) survey systems is foreseen in the case they join the euro zone.
- FR is testing a **credit card based system** in which the information form credit card issuers is combined with the data, originated from an inbound frontier survey (credits) and a household survey (debits), on the share of credit cards on total payments. The results of these tests will orient the final option, which may be the switch to a hybrid system.

---

[1] Acronyms for country names: Austria=AT, Belgium=BE, Denmark=DK, Finland=FI, France=FR, Germany=DE, Greece=GR, Ireland=IE, Italy=IT, Luxembourg=LU, Netherlands=NL, Portugal=PT, Spain=ES, Sweden=SE, United Kingdom=GB.

- PT intends to integrate the present system based on **bank reports and credit card data with estimates and models** (supported by surveys of travellers at accommodation establishments and surveys of tourist providers).

The comparison with the results of previous consultation held in 1999 shows that the implementation of plans has been significantly speeded up in the last two years. The majority of countries (ten) have already implemented the future systems or are testing them. Four countries (BE, DE, NL, PT) still have to start the actual testing and implementation of (some of) the sources. Approximately 60% of the sources that will compose the collection systems of EU MS from 2002 onwards have been already implemented, 20% are under test and 20% are planned.

Hence, a generalised switch to survey systems has emerged. This seems to have caused a tendency to a transfer of responsibilities from National Central Banks to National Statistical Institutes. The consultation showed that in 2002 the majority of countries (seven) surveys for Travel will be managed by NSI, in three countries (AT, ES, FR) there will be a co-operation between the two entities and only in three cases (DE, IT, SE) central banks will keep the exclusive responsibility (Sveriges Riksbank will pass the task to Statistics Sweden as from 2003).

Outstanding problems
The general impression is that the process of revision and the management of collection systems for Travel has required and will require in the near future substantial efforts and resources to the MS. The radical change of approach (from settlement systems to surveys) needs an adequate support and monitoring in the national contexts, in order to avoid a decline in data quality. This appears particularly relevant in the coming months for those countries still in the process of planning and testing systems, as the deadline of January 2002 approaches.

In addition to the mentioned organisational problems connected to the move of responsibilities from central banks to national statistical institutes, several methodological difficulties still to be solved have emerged. The main problems are briefly illustrated below. Since they are common to many MS, further exchanges of views in future meetings and in bilateral contact between the group members may be helpful.

Methodological problems in the implementation of surveys - Tests conducted in some countries showed that household survey tends to underestimate Travel figures. Volatility in the results of these surveys has been also observed. Countries relying on household surveys for the debit side often count on the exchange of data with partners for the credit side (mostly for the EU or EMU area); these MS are concerned about the actual availability of timely information from the partners. As regards frontier surveys, difficulties at Schengen borders in obtaining the co-operation of police and/or other frontier authorities have been pointed out.

Exhaustiveness of coverage of Travel transactions - In some countries same-day visitors are not covered by household surveys (in some cases this is a consequence of the use of surveys set up for the Council Directive on tourism statistics 95/57/CE, which does not require this information). In some countries data on the expenditures of seasonal and border workers seem difficult to collect. The exclusion of international passenger transportation expenditure from Travel is also considered problematic by some MS.

Detail of the output - Quite often the new surveys cannot provide the required breakdown by partner country and by purpose, due to the insufficient sample size. At least in the short run, additional estimates will be needed to solve the problem.

Possible break in time series - The question has been raised on the need to find out a (common) approach to deal with possible break in Travel series due to the introduction of new collection systems (e.g. Italy had to revise figures backwards after the set up of the frontier survey in 1996).

Offsetting entry in the financial account - It was agreed to analyse and discuss the method for the recording - in national BOP - of offsetting entries in the financial account for Travel transactions in the case of intra-

EMU Travel expenses paid with euro banknotes brought abroad by the traveller. To this end, a paper from Bank of Spain on this issue will be circulated among TGT members.

Harmonisation of collection systems in a medium/long term perspective - No convergence on a unique position has emerged within the TGT: some countries do not consider it feasible, roughly the same number of countries are in favour (unilateral reporting + exchange of data).

1.1.2. Bilateral comparison exercise

The analysis of Travel asymmetries that was started in the last TGT meeting requires additional bilateral contacts between the MS representatives in order to be finalised. Only some general results are therefore pointed out in this paragraph.

The first part of the analysis was an overall investigation of global bilateral figures of all EU MS. The analysis considered Eurostat data on 1997-1999 and partial / provisional data for the year 2000. Total reported credits tends to exceed total reported debits. Total asymmetries increased to 9.2 billion ecu in 1999 from 4.5 billion ecu in 1997 (6.9 in 1998). The index of relative asymmetry also increased to 9% in 1999 from 5% in 1997 (7% in 1998).

The second part of the study focused on seven countries represented in the TGT (Austria, France, Germany, Italy, Portugal, Spain and the UK). Bilateral annual Travel figures on the period 1997-2000 have been collected and processed (by Mr R. Dell'Mour). Following the approach used in previous exercises, figures of the participating countries (except for the UK which do not produce the relevant disaggregation) were broken down by means of payment, in order to attempt an identification of the possible causes of asymmetries.

The long-term analysis of the bilateral asymmetries of the four countries (Austria, France, Germany, Italy) that participated in the comparison exercises since the first round seems to confirm the usefulness of the work undertaken. After the first exercise held in 1997, global bilateral asymmetries (sum of the absolute values) of these countries on 1996 data decreased from 5 to 3.6 billion ECU. After the second exercise held in 1999, global bilateral asymmetries on 1998 data decreased from 2.4 to 1.1 billion ECU.

2. SPECIAL ISSUES FOR THE BOP WG

2.1 Conclusions /recommendations by the TG to be discussed and agreed upon by the BOP WG

The TGT members considered that the common discussion on the experiences related to the practical implementation of the collection systems for Travel is a helpful exercise that should be maintained at least in the near future. The analysis of the methodological problems still to be solved (see previous paragraph), that are likely to require further efforts for some time after January 2002, would benefit from a common forum like the TGT.

The TGT members also noted the effectiveness of the in-depth investigation of bilateral figures. They unanimously agreed that the exercise should be repeated regularly, involving all EU MS. The need to have periodic multilateral meetings to compare bilateral figures is even more desirable in the next few years, given the ongoing profound revision of collection systems, which unavoidably involves the need of mutual checks on the quality of the data produced.

Recommendations to the BOP WG
a.   Support the completion of testing and implementation activities for Travel collection systems in the national context of EU MS, in order to respect the deadline of January 2002.

b.   Maintain the TGT at least for the whole year 2002.

c.   Foresee in the medium term the setting up of a permanent group of experts on Travel, with a representative for each MS, as a multilateral forum with the specific task to analyse bilateral Travel figures.

2.2 Open problems for which the opinion / decision of the BOP Working Group is required

Any suggestion or comment on the problems mentioned above in paragraph 1.1.1 (under the heading 'Outstanding problems') is welcome.

2.3 General aspects regarding the TG activity (e.g. membership, proposal to adjust the mandate, etc.)

Enlargement of the participation at the meetings to all 15 MS, starting from next meeting (June 2002).

3. FUTURE WORK

2.1 Presentation of the work programme (short and medium term), which will have to be approved by the BOP WG

The group intends to meet again in June 2002. The meeting would deal with an update on national plans (oral/written presentations by MS representatives) and with a further round of bilateral comparisons.

In order to adapt to the more frequent use of surveys, a new form for the reporting of figures in the bilateral comparison exercise is envisaged, with a breakdown by type of visitor (same-day visitors vs. overnight visitors, breakdown by purpose, etc.) in substitution of the usual breakdown by means of payment. Figures on Passenger transport would be also analysed, in order to detect possible cases of misallocation between Transport and Travel. A discussion on methodologies to deduct Passenger Transport from Travel, particularly in relation to package tour expenditures (Travel, Transport, margin of tourist intermediaries) is also foreseen.

A n n e x

CONSULTATION

ON NATIONAL PLANS TO COLLECT TRAVEL STATISTICS

FROM 2002

Summary of the answers - EU countries

version 2.0 - 1 October 2001

Consultation
on National Plans to collect Travel Statistics
from 2002

Summary of the answers - EU countries

In June 2001 a written consultation was launched to collect information on plans and activities of EU MS and Candidate Countries concerning collection systems for the compilation of the Travel item of the balance of payments in the context of euro notes circulation (from January 2002). This document reports and summarises the answers of EU MS. The aim is to support the circulation of information on best practices in data collection, in line with the mandate assigned to the Technical Group Travel.

The consultation brings up to date the outcome of the previous exercise, carried out in March 1999, which is summarised in the Technical Group Travel Report - Annexes C and D. As a consequence, the filling of the questionnaire was not required for those countries that intend to maintain in 2002 the collection system for Travel which was already in operation in 1999. The countries in this situation were Finland, Ireland, Italy and the UK. Hence, for these countries the document reports the answers provided in occasion of the 1999 consultation. Denmark confirmed the answer provided in occasion of the written procedure on the TG Travel Report (doc. BP/00/38/E - Oct. 2000). For the Netherlands, the document integrates this country's answers through the questionnaire with an interpretation of an explanatory note subsequently transmitted.

Countries consulted and answers received

Country		Answer
Austria	AT	Yes
Belgium	BE	Yes
Denmark	DK	Yes (confirmed answer provided to Eurostat in September 2000)
Finland	FI	Yes (system used in 1999 maintained)
France	FR	Yes
Germany	DE	Yes
Greece	GR	No
Ireland	IE	Yes (system used in 1999 maintained)
Italy	IT	Yes (system used in 1999 maintained)
Luxembourg	LU	Yes
Netherlands	NL	Yes
Portugal	PT	Yes (national plan to be developed)
Spain	ES	Yes
Sweden	SE	Yes
United Kingdom	GB	Yes (system used in 1999 maintained)

A. Structure of the collection system in operation in 2002

Question 1

In order to schematically describe the collection system for Travel your country already use or intends to use in the context of euro circulation, fill in the table in next page by

⇒ *indicating the <u>prevailing usage</u> of each source, separately for the credits and the debits side. For each source and BOP side mark, with the symbols indicated below, only one of the three options. If necessary, more than one main source can be indicated;*

⇒ *indicating the <u>present</u> (June 2001) <u>state of implementation</u> of each source by using one of the following symbols:*

> *I = already implemented (used to produce BOP data)*
> *T = under test*
> *P = planned*

⇒ *indicating the <u>partner country area</u> of transactions addressed by each source, by using one or both of the following symbols:*

> *E= used for Travel transactions of your country vis-à-vis (other) EMU countries*
> *N= used for Travel transactions of your country vis-à-vis (other) non-EMU countries.*

E.g.: If the bank reporting system, which is already implemented, will be used as a main source for Travel credits and debits vis-à-vis non-EMU countries, write 'I N' in row S1, columns (1) and (4).

Table 1 - Structure of EU MS collection systems for Travel in operation in 2002

		S1 Bank reporting system (excluding credit card data)	S2 Credit card data (from banks)	S3 Credit card data (from credit card issuers)	S4 Frontier surveys	S5 Household surveys	S6 Surveys of travellers at accommodation establishments	S7 Surveys of tourist providers (e.g. hotels)	S8 Surveys of tourist intermediaries (eg. travel agencies)	S9 Partner country data	S10 Estimates and models	S11 Administrative sources	S12 Other sources
Austria	Credits	**Implemented**		**Implemented**						*Under test*	*Under test*		
	Debits	*Implemented*		*Implemented*		**Under test**							
Belgium	Credits	*Implemented*	*Implemented*	*Under test*			*Planned*	**Planned**			*Planned*	*Under test*	
	Debits	*Implemented*	*Implemented*	*Under test*		**Planned**					*Planned*	*Under test*	
Finland	Credits			[Implemented]	**Implemented**			[Implemented]				[Implemented]	
	Debits			[Implemented]	**Implemented**							[Implemented]	[Implemented]
France	Credits			**Implemented**	*Under test*								
	Debits			**Implemented**		*Under test*							
Germany	Credits	*Implemented*	*Implemented*	*Implemented*			[Implemented]			**Planned (EMU)**	**Planned (non-EMU)**		*Implemented*
	Debits	*Implemented*	*Implemented*	*Implemented*		**Under test**				[Planned (EMU)]	**Implemented**		*Implemented*
Greece	Credits	Answer not provided											
	Debits												
Ireland	Credits				**Implemented**							[Implemented]	**Implemented**
	Debits				**Implemented**								**Implemented**
Italy	Credits	[Implemented]	[Implemented]	[Implemented]	**Implemented**			[Implemented]	*Implemented*	[Implemented]			
	Debits	[Implemented]	[Implemented]	[Implemented]	**Implemented**	[Implemented]			*Implemented*	[Implemented]			
Luxembourg	Credits	[Implemented (non-EMU)]		**[Implemented]**							**Under test**	**Implemented**	**Under test**
	Debits	[Implemented (non-EMU)]		[Implemented]		**Under test**						**Implemented**	
Netherlands	Credits			*Planned*				**Planned**		*Planned*			*Planned*
	Debits			*Planned*		**Planned**				*Planned*			*Planned*
Portugal	Credits	**Implemented**	**Implemented**	**Implemented**	[Planned]		*Implemented*	*Implemented*			**Implemented**		
	Debits	**Implemented**	**Implemented**	**Implemented**	[Planned]						**Planned**		
Spain	Credits	[Implemented]	[Implemented]	[Implemented]	**Under test**			[Implemented]	*Under test*	[Planned]			
	Debits	[Implemented]	[Implemented]	[Implemented]	**Under test**	[Implemented]			*Under test*	[Planned]			
Denmark (**)	Credits	In the short run, until Denmark remains outside the EMU area, only problems in the geographical breakdown of transactions will be addressed; the survey of travellers at accommodation establishments carried out by the Danish Tourist Board and tourism statistics produced for the Council Directive 95/57/EC will be used, respectively, for the credit and the debit side.											
	Debits												
Sweden	Credits	**Implemented**		**Implemented**						**Implemented**	**Implemented**		
	Debits	*Implemented*		*Implemented*		*Implemented*				*Implemented*	*Implemented*		
United Kingdom	Credits				**Implemented**					*Implemented*			
	Debits				**Implemented**					*Implemented*			

LEGEND
Bold underlined: Main source
Italic: Supplementary source
[Between square brackets]:   Source used for verification

Question 1

Further remarks

DE - **S12 - Other sources: Data on eurocheque debit cards (from banks and clearing agencies).**

FI - **S12 - Statistics on International flights; Statistics on International passenger transport by sea.**

FR - The system planned by France will be essentially based on the report of the credit card issuers and on the part of payments by card and withdrawals at cash machine, resulting from the two surveys. As far as the surveys are concerned, the expenditure breakdown by means of payments as well as the total amount of expenses will be used as a controlling reference.

GB – S9 - The UK currently uses partner country data from Ireland to supplement the IPS frontier survey data. The IPS is being expanded from April 1999 to cover routes to and from Ireland.

IE - The 'Travel' statistics compiled by CSO are largely survey based and are collected and processed by the Tourism and Travel Section. The relevant BOP information is supplied to BOP Section.
S5, S6 and S7 - Sources are being implemented at present. Results to be compiled in 1999.
S11 - i.e. Irish Tourism Board.
S12 - Airport administration enterprise and sea transport enterprises.

IT - **S5 - ISTAT household survey on domestic and outbound tourism (physical flows and expenditures).**
S7 - ISTAT data on stays of non resident tourists in collective accommodation establishments (physical flows).
S8 - Data from a sample of resident tour operators and travel agencies on average international air fares, used to estimate the international transportation expenditures to be deducted from Travel (see below Question 2).

LU - **As border workers represent one-third (33%) of the internal employment, a survey on cross-border workers (credits) is planned. Actually we are reliant on the budget laid out by the concerned authorities.**
S12 - Other sources: Accommodation statistics (number of tourists, their country of residence, the number of overnight stays).

NL - **S3 - Information from clearing houses. In the Netherlands there are a few (three major) clearing houses who process yearly by advanced computer systems billions of payments which are done by debit cards, Maestro, Eurocard / Master Card, SET (payments and settlements on Internet) by private persons as well as by business institutions. In September 2001 we intend to make arrangements with those clearing houses about the deliverance of information broken down geographically.**
S5, S7 - Already existing statistical surveys extended with specific questions.

PT - **Joint study (Banco de Portugal and INE) under way. Main features of future system: integration of present system with additional sources (possibly surveys). Timetable: design of future system by end 2001, tests and possible adjustments in 2002.**

SE - **S1 - Bank reporting system will be abolished in 2003 and replaced with a survey system. We will however continue the direct reporting on exchange of banknotes and traveller's cheques as well as from card companies. The methods will have to be revised in case of Sweden's joining the EMU.**

B. Description of surveys composing the collection system in operation in 2002

Question 2 [ONLY FOR COUNTRIES INTENDING TO USE SURVEYS (S4-S8) AS A MAIN OR SUPPLEMENTARY SOURCE]

For each survey used/planned give the following details (one page per survey - use additional sheets if needed)

a. Organisation responsible

AT -	Oesterreichische Nationalbank together with Statistics Austria (Tourism Statistics)
BE(1), BE(2) -	Statistics Belgium
DE -	Deutsche Bundesbank
ES -	INE, IET, Banco de España
FI(1) -	Statistics Finland
FI(2) -	Statistics Finland / Finnish Tourist Board (financier)
FR(1), FR(2) -	Direction of tourism and Banque de France
GB -	Office for National Statistics (ONS)
IE(1), IE(2) -	Central Statistics Office
IT(1), IT(2) -	Ufficio Italiano dei Cambi
LU -	STATEC
NL(1), NL(2) -	Statistics Netherlands
SE -	Sveriges Riksbank (as from 2003, Statistics Sweden will produce the Travel item and may shift to other methods)

b. Name of the survey

AT -	Travel Expenditures abroad
BE(1) -	Travel Survey
BE(2) -	Tourism survey
DE -	Reiseausgaben im Ausland (Travel expenditure abroad)
ES -	EGATUR (Encuesta de Gasto Turístico)
FI(1) -	Finnish Travel Survey
FI(2) -	Finnish Border Survey
FR(1) -	Suivi des Déplacements touristiques des français (SDT)
FR(2) -	Enquête aux frontières (Frontier Survey)
GB -	International Passenger Survey (IPS)
IE(1) -	Passenger Card Inquiry
IE(2) -	Country of Residence Survey
IT(1) -	Frontier survey on international tourism
IT(2) -	Survey of tour operators and travel agencies on average international transportation fares (supplementary source that supports the 'frontier survey on international tourism')
LU -	Tourismusvolumen und Reiseverhalten der Wohnbevölkerung des Grossherzogtums Luxemburg

NL(1) -   **Continuous Vacation Survey (CVS)**

NL(2) -   **Survey on tourist accommodation**

SE -   **Travel**

c. Type of survey

S4 Frontier survey **- ES, FI(2), FR(2), GB, IE(1), IE(2), IT(1)**

S5 Household survey **- AT, BE(1), DE, FI(1), FR(1), LU, NL(1), SE**

S6 Survey of travellers at accommodation establishments **- NL(2)**

S7 Survey of tourist providers **- BE(2)**

S8 Survey of tourist intermediaries **- IT(2)**

other (specify)

d. Direction

Inbound (Travel credits) **- BE(2), FI(2), FR(2), NL(2)**

Outbound (Travel debits) **- AT, BE(1), DE, FI(1), FR(1), LU, NL(1), SE**

Inbound and outbound **- ES, GB, IE(1), IE(2), IT(1), IT(2)***

IT(2)* - Only resident tour operators and travel agencies are sampled but information is used for both sides of BOP (credits and debits).

e. Data collection method

face-to-face interviews **- ES, FI(2), GB, IE(2), IT(1),**

telephone interviews **- AT, DE, FI(1), LU, SE**

postal questionnaire **- BE(1), BE(2), DE, FR(1), IT(2)**

other (specify) **- FR(2)*, IE(1)*, NL(1)*, NL(2)***

FR(2)*- Self-completed questionnaire

IE(1)* - Passengers selected for survey requested to complete forms and leave them for collection.

NL(1)*- Mostly by using an Internet application.

NL(2)*- First contact through postal questionnaire, subsequent contacts through telephone interview.

f. Sample size

AT -	**12,000**
BE(1) -	**+- 8200 households (panel survey)**
BE(2) -	**+- 3500 establishments**
DE -	**20 000 trips per year**
ES -	**86,000**
FI(1) -	**4 X 2,100**
FI(2) -	**15,000**

FR(1) -	20,000 households
FR(2) -	160,000 questionnaires planned
GB -	250,000 per annum
IE(1) -	INWARDS: approx. 200,000 OUTWARDS: approx 220,000
IE(2) -	INWARDS: approx. 225,000 OUTWARDS: approx 270,000
IT(1) -	150,000 annual interviews + 1,500,000 counting operations
IT(2) -	7 major Italian tour operator and travel agencies
LU -	6,000 valid interviews
NL(1) -	7,000 persons
SE -	24,000

g. Beginning of data collection (year)

AT-	1988
BE(1) -	(1996) 1997
BE(2) -	1991
DE -	2001
ES -	May 2000
FI(1) -	1991
FI(2) -	1998
FR(1) -	April 1999
FR(2) -	November 2000
GB -	1961
IE(1), IE(2) -	1980 (approx)
IT(1), IT(2) -	1996
LU -	1997
NL(1) -	Already existing survey. A new version will start in October 2001 for tests.
SE -	1999

h. Frequency of data collection

continuously **- AT, DE, ES, FI(2), FR(2), GB, IE(1), IE(2), IT(1)**

monthly **- BE(2), FR(1)**

quarterly **- BE(1), FI(1), LU, NL(1), NL(2)**

half-yearly

yearly **- IT(2)**

other (specify) **- SE***

SE*- Every 5th year since 1989

i. (Maximum) frequency of data published

`monthly` **- DE (global figures), ES, FR(1), FR(2), GB, IT(1), IT(2), NL(1)**

`quarterly` **-   AT (monthly BOP is going to use estimates based on settlements data), BE(1), BE(2), DE (country figures), FI(1), IE(1), IE(2)**

`half-yearly` **- FI(2)**

`yearly` **- LU**

`other (specify)` **- SE***

SE*-   Every 5th year

j.   Level of geographical breakdown of data published

(indicate the Eurostat BOP Vademecum - March 2001- levels of geographical breakdown which approximately correspond, for each data frequency – see previous point)

Level of geographical breakdown	Maximum frequency	Annual data
No geo breakdown	**DE**	
Level 1	**AT, BE(1), ES, FI(1), FR(1), FR(2), GB, IE(1) part, IE(2) part, IT(1), IT(2), NL(1)*, NL(2)***	**BE(1), ES*, FR(1), FR(2), IE(1) part, IE(2) part, NL(1)*, NL(2)***
Level 2		*FI(1)*, FI(2)**
Level 3	**LU**	**AT*, DE, LU**
Level 4	**BE(2)**	**BE(2), GB, IT(1), IT(2)**
Other	**SE***	**SE***

AT* -   Data at level 4 are obtained through estimates carried out by the Oesterreichische Nationalbank.

ES* -   Data at level 4 are obtained through estimates carried out by the Bank of Spain.

FI(1)*, FI(2)* -   Level 2 existed in the old classification (see Eurostat BOP Vademecum - August 1997) used as a reference in previous consultation (1999).

SE* -   The report is published on the Riksbank's website www.riksbank.se, with a breakdown similar to level 3. The data are then used to estimate the breakdown on the 20 countries of most importance.

NL(1)*, NL(2)* -   Split of partner area between Intra-EMU, EU-non EMU and Extra-EU.

k.   Type of data provided by the survey

`expenditure data (with or without physical data)` **- AT, BE(1) (expenditure + physical data), DE, ES, FI(1), FI(2), FR(1), FR(2), GB IT(1), IT(2), IE(1), LU, NL(1), SE**

`physical data only (e.g. number of night stays, number of visitors)` **- BE(2), IE(2), NL(2)**

`If the survey only produces physical data, explain below how the conversion to expenditure data is carried out (e.g. estimation procedure)`

BE(2)- A survey on tourist expenditure will be used thereby multiplying the number of nights by the average expenditure by nationality and by type of accommodation used. F.e. a stay at camping will have a lower average expenditure then a hotel accommodation. Also nights at let holiday accommodation will be taken into account although these last data are not published in the survey results.

IE(2) - Country of residence data used to provide a geographical breakdown of inward travel expenditure (BOP credits) from Passenger Survey results.

NL(2) - For the year 2002 we intend to use data from the Statistic Incoming Tourism (SIT) which is conducted by Statistics Netherlands. For the future this is no option because SIT is carried out once in five year. However, there is an external market research agency in the Netherlands (with branches in more than 30 countries all over the world) that conducts a European Holiday Survey simultaneously in seven major European countries (the Netherlands, Belgium, Germany, France, Great Britain, Spain and Italy). By adding a question about spending amounts, it is possible to get an indicator which can be multiplied by the number of foreign visitors from the statistic on tourist accommodation. Negotiations are carried out at this moment .

l.   Time span between reference period and availability of provisional data (months)

AT -   1.5 months (estimates) 3 months (actual data)

BE(1), BE(2) - 3 months for quarterly results, 6 months for yearly results

DE -   5-6 months

ES -   T+ 30 days

FI(1) -   2.5 months

FI(2) -   4/5 months

FR(1) -   13 weeks

FR(2) -   not yet defined

GB -   1.5 months

IE(1), IE(2) - 4 months

IT(1), IT(2) - 1 month

LU -   2 months

SE -   1 month

n.   Main deviations from definitions of IMF BPM5 (e.g. purpose of travel, inclusion of same – day visitors, international transportation expenditure)

AT -   Survey includes "Same day travellers", "Transportation" and "Purpose".

BE(1) - Same day visitor not included. Business travel underestimated due to non response.

BE(2) - Same day visitor are not included.

DE -   No deviation.

ES -   None.

FI(1) - The sample size is too small to collect information on health-related and education-related trips. Trips of seasonal and border workers are not included. The statistical unit is individual not a household, and the reference population is limited to persons aged 15-74 years, thus the trips of those under 15 and over 74 years are excluded. The maximum length of trips included is 3 months.

FI(2) - The maximum length of all trips is limited to 12 months, concerning also heath-related and education-related trips. Trips of seasonal and border workers are not included.

FR(1)- Expenditure of seasonal and border workers are not taken into account. The reference population of the survey is slightly different from the residents since the following elements of the population are not taken into account : 1) foreigners living in France 2) one day

travellers 3) residents in overseas territories 4) children under 15 and travelling alone. The survey does not include the over 4 month stays.

FR(2) - None.

GB - None.

IE(1) - Passenger transportation fares paid to non-resident carriers included indistinguishably under 'travel' (debits).

IE(2) - None.

IT(1) - No relevant deviation – For international transportation expenditures see description of survey IT(2) in question 2.

Further remarks

BE(1)   National bank is still negotiating with Belgium Statistics in order to add supplementary questions to be able to obtain a ratio of credit card settlements on total transactions. This could be used to estimate monthly data and for verification and estimation purposes.

FR(1), FR(2)   International transportation expenses included in the described expenses in the survey will be dealt with in a coming statistical treatment in order to remain in accordance with the V manual of the IMF and to ensure the continuation of the present data of the balance of payments

LU -   Expenditures made by same-day travellers or excursionists (debit) are covered by the extended survey set up for the Council Directive.

IT(2) -   This survey is used to integrate the frontier survey data. It allows to estimate the imputed value of international transportation expenditures of respondents who were not able to provide this specific information at the time of the interview at borders.

SE -   The survey is used as a benchmark to supply breakdowns on countries and personal/business travel. The main source is still data on banknotes, travellers' cheques and credit cards. As from 2003, Statistics Sweden will be responsible for the compilation of the Travel item and they may choose to change to other methods than the present one.

C. Assessment of the quality of the collection system in operation in 2002

Question 3

Will the collection system in operation in 2002 ensure a comprehensive <u>coverage</u> of Travel transactions, in terms of BOP side and partner country area, type of visitor and means of payment used (see Table 2, columns 1-10, in the TGT Report, § 3.1) ?

Yes **- ES*, FR*, SE**

Further remarks

ES* - **Likely objections: In the case of means of payment used, by the moment, we can not assure that the coverage of Travel transactions will be ensured. The breakdown by means of payments provided by the first results of the survey system is not fully reliable.**

FR* - **Except for the problems that have been mentioned in question 2 - point n., concerning the household survey.**

No, because of problems in the following areas:

AT - **For Debits. All means of payment are covered, but no breakdown will be available. For Credits: Cash payments in EURO have to be estimated.**

BE - **We will have to make estimates for same day travel because for the time being there is no data available. For neighbouring countries those excursions might run up to more than 50% of travel income and expenditures. On the debit side, we also have to make estimates for business travel because survey response is not satisfactory.**

DE - **For credits we will in part have to rely on partner country information, which may not be available for all countries.**

LU - **In our future compilation system for the «travel» items the type of means of payment will be of a very reduced importance.**

NL - **We do not get our information in a detailed way from our internal sources.**

Question 4

Will the collection system in operation in 2002 ensure the minimum Travel figures <u>disaggregation</u> (geographical breakdown and breakdown by purpose) and <u>deadlines</u> for reporting to fulfil the requirements for BOP data of Eurostat and the ECB ? (see Table 1 in the TGT Report, § 1.6)

Yes - **BE*, ES*, NL**

Further remarks

BE* - The household survey is not representative to obtain a full breakdown for the smaller geographical entities. To make a full level geo breakdown we will have to relay on travel agent payments from bank and direct reporting system.

ES* - Likely objections: In the case of the geographical allocation, the Level 3 requested by EUROSTAT in yearly questionnaires is not completely covered with the data obtained with the new system. Some additional estimates will be needed.

No, because of problems in the following areas:

AT - Breakdown by purpose will be available only for debits.

DE - For first results, provisional estimates will be needed.

FR - Disaggregation: the sample size will not be sufficient to allow a complete geographical breakdown. The geographical breakdown available per month will only concern the main partner countries and the main geographical areas.
Deadlines : Outcome of the surveys will never meet with the ECB deadlines and data will be, as today, estimated from the amounts of credit cards transactions reported by the issuers and grossed up to the total receipts and expenditure by means of an estimated rate of credit card expenditure.

LU - In the near future it is not expected to publish the splitting «border workers (IMF238)/other (IMF239)» for the «business travel» item.

SE - Regarding the credit side we will not have information enough to make an accurate breakdown by purpose and country. A co-ordinated exchange of data within the EU would be valuable

D. Problems and indications for future developments

Question 5

Can you indicate the major problems (e.g. technical, methodological, organisational) you have faced in the planning and the implementation of the future collection system for Travel ?

AT - Volatility of results will increase significantly due to sampling. Timing and method of interviews, even changes in wording can change results significantly. Geographical allocation differs extremely between settlements and surveys.

BE - We are not sure of the comprehensive coverage due to the very big importance of same day visitors.

DE - A major problem will be to produce estimates on the credit side for countries from which we will receive no partner country data.

ES - Breakdown by means of payments. Difficulties to fulfil the sample size for a few strata and quotas for some specific nationalities. Expenses in origin. Packages tours.

FR - The main problems we face concern:
1) the results of the household survey provided by the private company carrying out the survey (problem of quality of the work provided and breakdown by means of payments completely different from the BOP).
2) numerous difficulties on the field of the inbound frontier survey, especially at the border crossings because of the repeated absence of the police force "gendarmerie" to stop the cars, preventing the interviewers to distribute the questionnaires.

LU - As mentioned under question 1, we depend on the authorised budget concerning our planned cross-border workers survey (credit).

NL - Finding the right sources internal as well as external and matching definitions and data from previous publications (National Bank, National Accounts and Travel Survey Statistics Netherlands).

SE - We foresee problems for the credit side (see question 4).

Question 6

In the light of your recent experience, do you envisage and/or favour any harmonised system for the collection of statistics on Travel in the EU area, in a medium-long term perspective? What general characteristics should it have ?

AT - Harmonised collection systems are hardly feasible.

BE - A compulsory harmonised system would lead to better results because more resources will have to be given to conduct more appropriate surveys instead of trying to adapt existing ones. However a harmonised system that fits the specific geographical situation of every country might be very difficult to elaborate.

DE - No, we don't think it is advisable as long as national data are required.

FR - France is favourable to a setting-up of a travel data collection harmonised system in a medium term. According to us, frontier surveys corresponding to the needs of the BOP compilers and the Eurostat and ECB requirements, seem to be the most appropriate system. We would like to underline that a project of the World tourism organisation, in which France, Italy and Spain are

taking part into, of a common draft questionnaire for frontier survey is about to be elaborated. We think that this project could be a starting point of a European project.

LU - Considering the distinctive characteristics inherent to each country (including the different status of compilers: NCB, NSI) we do not believe that a harmonised collection system will be feasible. To our feeling the first attention should be focused on a harmonised output. Furthermore we fully support circulation of information, sharing of experiences and exchange of data.

NL - Yes, a one way registration on international travel spending with a geographical breakdown by purpose of travel.

SE - A survey system (border or household) in combination with exchange of data between the MS.

E. Timetable for future actions

Question 7

Indicate a timetable, even tentative/approximate, for the subsequent phases of implementation of the collection system for Travel planned to face the problems involved by the Euro circulation.

Country	Action	Time (month/year)
AT	Switch to new system.	Jan 2002
BE	Testing of the planned method with the actually existing system for the available data 2000.	Oct. 2001
DE	Preliminary survey results for the first six months of 2001. First comparisons of the results from the bank reporting system and the survey.	Sep. 2001
	Estimates of models for short term forecasting of debits and credits.	Oct. / Nov. 2001
	Final survey results for 2001; final comparison of BRS and survey.	May / Jun. 2002
FR	First dissemination on January 2002 of reference for the household survey results concerning the expenditure abroad of residents.	May 2002
LU	Business and other personal travel debit-figures will be derived from the survey set up for the Council Directive (back-data will be integrated in the BLEU-bop).	Sep. 2001
	Availability of national plans (debit and credit).	Dec. 2001
NL	Implementation	Jan. 2002
	Dissemination first quarterly results	Jun. / Jul. 2002