Managing cost of the social security administration

12 March 2004

Bangkok

ILO SRO-Bangkok

Social security team

Outline of the presentation

- 1. Overview of social security administration
- † 2. Analytic dimensions of administration cost
- † 3. International comparison of administration cost

To start with.....

Check all aspects of social security, regardless of the functions or the institutions

- e.g. Functions
 - (a1) Decision-making
 - (a2) Planning
 - (a3) Implementation

Institutions

- (b1) the State
- (b2) Social security organizations

- **†** Functions
- 1. Decision-making
 - Parliament
 - Social security boards
- † 2. Planning
 - Legislation
 - Finance
 - Administration

- **†** Functions
- † 3. Implementation
 - Registration of employees and contributors
 - Contribution collection
 - Benefit disbursement
 - Cash benefits
 - In-kind benefits
 - Record keeping
 - Statistics
 - Public relations

- **†** Institutions
- † 1. the State
 - Civil servants
 - Cost financed through general revenue of the states, e.g. taxations
- † 2. Social security organizations
 - Sometimes branch of the State (composed of civil servants), sometimes autonomous organizations (with separate account or fund)
 - Cost financed through contributions or state subsidies

- 1. Major cost item
 - Major cost on labour (labour intensive work)
 - => rationalization of personnel cost essential
- † 2. Cost for planning social security
 - Minor compared with implementation cost
 - Often funded through taxation for civil servants planning social security in central government
 - In-house legislative, actuarial and administrative expertise permanent core for well-functioning scheme
 - => outsourcing not easily recommended

† 3. Cost for implementation

- Major cost for collecting contributions
 - => rationalization of cost for contribution collection essential
 - => Employers' understanding and collaborations key for contribution collection for schemes for salaried workers
 - => Major challenges for collecting contributions for schemes for self-employed
 - cf. collection through cooperatives etc. collaborations with tax agency

† 3. Cost for implementation

- Streamlining of operations essential
 - not only beneficial for well-functioning and customer-oriented social security with better service
 - but also contributing to cost containment, mainly through rationalizing personnel cost
 - => setting and simplifying standard procedures computerization

- † 3. Cost for implementation
 - Material cost
 - Cost for facilities and computerization substantial
 - Computerization pays, taking into account rationalized personnel cost and better service for beneficiaries
 - -Running cost (water, electricity etc.) difficult to cut down

1 4. Other issues on cost

- Scale merit and collaboration with other agencies
 - some cost not proportionately increasing to the scale of the scheme
 - e.g. cost for planning cost for cash benefit determination by computer system
 - better collaboration with other agencies
 - e.g. government agencies (tax agencies, labour inspection department) employers/employees cooperatives

† 4. Other issues on cost

- Investment
 - Fundamental principles controlled by Board
 - e.g. less risky long-term investment for pension fund short-term financial flow sustained
 - Daily operations fists for outsourcing to financial institutions
 - Direct investment (e.g. land, buildings) not recommended without proper governance and in-house expertise
 - => tends to be politically abused

† 4. Other issues on cost

- Expenditure other than benefits and standard administration cost
 - e.g. Welfare facilities for contributors and beneficiaries (hospitals, hotels, resorts etc.)

 Subsidies for semi-public organizations

 Loans to contributors and beneficiaries with favourable interest rate
 - => **should be restrictive**, otherwise; equity of the fund and trust to the fund could be damaged.

Social Security Administrative Costs as a % of Benefit Expenditures

Latin America and the Caribbean		OECD		
Mean	27.78	Mean	3.12 1.28	
Standard deviation	31.16	Standard deviation		
Antigua-Barbuda	n/a	Australia	1.22	
Argentina	2.30	Austria	2.48	
Bahamas	30.75	Belgium	4.55	
Barbados	5.56	Canada	2.80	
Belize	89.49	Denmark	2.98	
Bolivia 21.39		Finland	3.36	
Brazil	7.00	France	4.18	
Chile			2.86	
Colombia			6.72	
Costa Rica	4.75	Iceland	1.71	
Cuba	n/a	Ireland	4.88	
Dominica	46.97	Italy	2.20	
Dominican Rep.	31.72	Japan	1.79	
Ecuador	13.5 5	Luxembourg	2.74	
El Salvador	33.40	Netherlands	3.10	
Grenada	9.85	New Zealand	2.42	
Guatemala	12.72	Norway	1.00	
Guyana	22.66	Portugal	4.86	
Haiti	n/a	Spain	2.81	
Honduras	18.25	Sweden	4.24	
Jamaica	6.40	Switzerland	3.04	
Mexico	23.55	Turkey	2.62	
Nicaragua	n/a	United Kingdom	3.10	
Panama	5. 8 8	United States	3.28	
Paraguay	n/a			
Peru	130.98			
St. Lucia	48.31			
St. Vincent	n/a			
Surinam	n/a			
Trinidad & Tobago	15.29			
Uruguay	6.51			
Venezuela	17.46			

Administrative cost of Lao SSO and Thai SSO

	Lao SSO		Thai SSO	
	2001	2002	1993	2002
Admin cost / benefits	44.5%	18.9%	10.7%	6.2%
Admin cost / contributions	15.6%	5.4%	2.8%	2.1%

Comparison of administration cost - Japanese case

	Administration cost	Collected amount	Ratio	Staff number
	(billion yen)	(billion yen)		·
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
National Pension (NP)	15.91	196.48	8.1%	5,850
Employees' Pension Insurance (EPI)	15.25	2,616.92	0.6%	11,250
National Tax	73.28	5,391.71	1.4%	56,466

Needs attention to different country context e.g. History of the scheme

Higher percentage at the initial stage (capital investment and start-up cost and smaller benefits)

Different type of the scheme

Level of overall administration in the nation (taxation, inspection)

† However, overall governance is the key for effective cost containment