



Austria

Assessment of the 2008-2010 National Reform Programmes for Growth and Jobs from a social inclusion perspective: The extent of synergies between growth and jobs and social inclusion policies

Karin Heitzmann
WU Wien

Disclaimer: This report reflects the views of its author(s) and these are not necessarily those of either the European Commission or the Member States.

October 2008



On behalf of the
European Commission
DG Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities



Content

1. Summary	4
2. Overall assessment of implementation of the 2005-2008 NRP during the past year from a social inclusion perspective	4
3. Assessment of the 2008-2010 NRP from the perspective of social inclusion	6
3.1. Overall assessment	7
3.2. Feeding out.....	7
3.2.1. Employment and feeding out.....	7
3.2.2. Economic growth, financial sustainability and feeding out	10
3.3. Feeding in.....	11
3.4. Governance	11
3.4.1. Monitoring and assessment.....	11
3.4.2. Involvement of stakeholders	12
3.4.3. Coordination	12
4. References	13
Annex	14

1. Summary

Even though the 2008-2010 Austrian NRP as well as the 2008-2010 Austrian NSRSPSI both make clear that interactions between economic policy, labour market policy and social policy (including social inclusion policy) are crucial, they are mainly found in principle statements at the beginning of both reports rather than carried through by a thorough assessment of feeding in and feeding out perspectives.

The 2008-2010 NSRSPSI includes at the beginning a rather general statement on the relevance of the interaction between the social inclusion strategy and the growth and employment strategy. In many cases, these interactions are quite evident with regard to selected measures. However, they are in most cases not made explicit. Thus, it is necessary to incorporate feeding in and feeding out perspective to a much larger degree in the NSRSPSI, preferably at the level of measures or (reform) plans.

In the 2008-2010 NRP, social inclusion issues are granted a more prominent role (e.g. by way of introducing Chapter VII) than compared to the second implementation report of the 2005-2008 NRP. This suggests that there was a strengthening of the social dimension in the 2008-2010 NRP – at least in terms of reporting. However, even though interactions between policies are evident in many cases, they are also not made explicit in the Chapters on microeconomic and macroeconomic policies. Interactions with social inclusion are maybe more prominent in terms of labour market policies – and made explicit in the relevant Chapter, however, only to some part. Thus, there is still quite some room for improving reporting on feeding in and feeding out – let alone for adopting this perspective in formulating and implementing policy reforms.

A significant shortcoming of the NRP 2008-2010 is that future reform plans are largely missing – given that the coalition government ended its cooperation at the beginning of this summer. New elections took place on September 28th, 2008. A new government is expected to be installed only at the end of this year. A revised strategy of the NRP will then be elaborated and sent by the new government.

2. Overall assessment of implementation of the 2005-2008 NRP during the past year from a social inclusion perspective

In contrast to the last implementation report, the 2008-2010 NRP refers to a somewhat larger extent to both the **social dimension of the reform programme** and the recognition of feeding in and feeding out aspects. In terms of interactions between economic, labour market and social inclusion policies, the report states that it refers to the social dimension of the reform programme in two ways (pg. 4): First, the main Chapters are to include references to the social effects of (economic and labour market) reform policies. However, when studying the relevant Chapters, this referral is largely missing, especially in Chapters III and IV, or it is not made very explicit. Second, the report includes a separate Chapter on the interactions with social policy¹ (Chapter VII). However, this Chapter is quite short in length and rather refers to (stand-alone) social policy reforms than discussing the interactions of economic and labour market policies with social

¹ It has been made clear, moreover, that the NSRSPSI 2008-2010 for Austria complements the NRP 2008-2010 (pg. 48).

policy. It thus appears to me that feeding in and feeding out are still largely interpreted as a necessary requirement to fulfil the guidelines of the Commission in terms of reporting, rather than viewed as a serious attempt to consider and seriously examine interactions between the different policy fields. Thus, applying a social inclusion perspective within the NRP (and a growth and employment perspective in the NSRSPSI) still needs to be fundamentally improved.

In terms of **good practices** concerning feeding in and feeding out, the Austrian NRP does not include enough information on measures to judge whether they might serve as good-practice examples or not – maybe with the exception of the four-tier Austrian flexicurity strategy (pg. 41ff). However, according to my opinion, the latter demands more flexibility of employees than it grants security to them: thus, I would not suggest it to be a good practice from a social inclusion perspective. The difficulty to identify good Austrian practices is, moreover, caused by an overall lack of impact assessments: hardly any of them are made or integrated in the report. This also refers to an overall assessment of the reform strategy – an exercise that up until this year has been conducted by a research institute (see Section 3.4.1. below). Impact assessments that do exist are usually not referring to feeding in or feeding out aspects: concepts that are still pretty unfamiliar in the Austrian debate. However, similarly to the Ministry of Social Affairs, also the Federal Chancellery of the Republic of Austria recently issued a study to identify dimensions of feeding in and feeding out. The results of these studies – and the possible effects they might have on the reporting of the ministries responsible for the NSRSPSI and the NRP – will only be available in 2009, though.

In terms of last year's **progress concerning the implementation of the 2005-2008 NRP**, measures have been implemented in both 2007 and 2008. They focus on the strategic core areas (*Kernbereiche*), which show close links to inclusion issues. Concerning the target to achieve a balanced budget (pg. 7), this mainly refers to an increase of expenditures for education. However, shortly before the general elections, the parliament voted for the abolishment of university fees. It is not clear, whether and how the government plans to substitute this income loss. Moreover, the financial crisis is expected to affect the real economy: it is thus more than likely that the (new) government will not achieve the aim of a balanced budget by 2010. Whether it is able to finance a tax reform, which ought to be implemented by 2010, is also uncertain; not least as the parliament decided on some reforms shortly before the elections (such as the abolishment of university fees, but also the increase of some social transfers), which – according to some critiques – diminished the room for manoeuvre for a general tax reform.

Curbing the high inflation rate in Austria is one of the main political targets (pg. 7). Concerning this topic, moreover, explicit references are made to the effects of high inflation for disadvantaged groups. Measures that have been decided upon include a price-stop concerning various administrative costs (*Gebührenstopp*) and the valorisation of rents by the average inflation rate for 2007 (2.2 per cent) rather than the December value (in which inflation amounted to 3.6 per cent²). Price monitoring, particularly in case of necessities and energy costs, has also been discussed as a measure to keep inflation low. Particularly relevant for the elderly is the decision to valorise the (insurance) pension for 2009 not by January, but already by November 2008. A further measure with direct effects on low income groups is the reduction and – for low-income earners – the abolishment of contributions to unemployment insurance (pg. 8).

In terms of employment policies, the report refers to several problems that are relevant for social policy reasons, such as the gender segmentation of the labour market (pg. 8). The flexibilisation

² http://www.statistik.at/web_de/static/vpi_aktuelle_werte_022832.pdf

of the Austrian childcare allowance is argued to have enhanced incentives for mothers to re-enter the labour market earlier than so far. Prior to the elections, the political parties also discussed a further reform of childcare allowance: Instead of one of the options, which is currently organized as a flat rate universal benefit, an insurance-based transfer ought to be re-introduced: this transfer is projected to be granted for one year and amounts to a monthly benefit level of between € 1,000 and € 2,000. If this reform is implemented by a new government, it might indeed (i) provide incentives for better-earning women to get children, and (ii) provide incentives for fathers to take on parental leave. This measure targets the middle-income sector, while those on low income might still choose the flat rate allowance, which is granted for a longer period, though.

In the context of employment policies, the report also mentions further measures that have been implemented in recent years, among them a 'modernization' of the conditions under which the unemployed are forced to take on a job (*Zumutbarkeit*). However, what is termed 'modernization' in this context is rather cynical, as this mainly implies deteriorations for the unemployed in terms of allowing for longer distances between home and the workplace (*Arbeitsweg*).

A further political target included in the 2005-2008 NRP refers to education (pg. 9). The government introduced an education guarantee for young people up until the age of 18. This mainly refers to apprentices, and thus directly affects unemployment rates of young people. Further measures that target the aim of a better education refer to disadvantaged children and young people, particularly those with a migration background (such as language promotion). The interaction between this (and other measures) with social inclusion is obvious.

A further core area, in which reforms have been implemented in recent years, is the social system (pg. 9). Measures implemented recently include an increase of the long-term care allowance benefit and the introduction of financial support in case of 24-hour-care for the elderly. A minimum wage ought to be implemented up until 2009 within all contracts covered by collective agreements. The interactions of these measures with social inclusion policy are evident, however, not discussed explicitly.

Even though also other strategic core areas mentioned in the NRP are correlated with social inclusion (e.g. measures to allow for a more efficient resource management, particularly in terms of housing, but also measures to improve the infrastructure, pg. 8f), these interactions are not mentioned at all.

3. Assessment of the 2008-2010 NRP from the perspective of social inclusion

In terms of future measures, the Austrian NRP only states that due to the elections, which took place on September 28th, it has not been possible to integrate concrete plans and/or measures for the future in the NRP. Chapters III, IV and V thus mainly include a description of measures that have already been implemented. A revised NRP – which then ought to include details on future plans – will be elaborated by the new government (and thus only be available in 2009). In recognition of current challenges, however, it is expected that future measures will focus on nine core areas (pg. 6): (i) tackling high inflation; (ii) improving out-of-house childcare; (iii) modernising the educational system; (iv) introducing a tax reform in 2010; (v) improving employee involvement; (vi) guaranteeing the financial sustainability of the budget; (vii) further providing provisions for long-term care; (viii) investing into research, education and innovation and (ix) investing into environmental measures. Social dimensions are only considered with regard to two

of the measures mentioned within the NRP: improving childcare (to increase female employment) and modernising the educational system (among others to integrate and reintegrate disadvantaged population groups).

3.1. Overall assessment

Prior to the chapters on microeconomic, macroeconomic and labour market policies, the NRP includes a chapter on the recommendations and points to watch included in the Annual Progress Report 2007 of the European Commission³. According to the latter report, the policy areas in the Austrian National Reform Programme, where challenges need to be tackled with the highest priority, include two areas: *“further improve incentives for older workers to continue working by implementing a comprehensive strategy including enhanced job-related training, adaptation of working conditions and tightening the conditions for early retirement; and improve education outcomes for vulnerable youth.”* The Progress Report also identified the following five points-to-watch: *“strengthening the fiscal adjustment in order to achieve a balanced budget before 2010; increasing competition in services, in particular in professional services; strengthening entrepreneurship education; identifying further emission reduction policies and measures; tackling the gender segregation of the labour market, including by further improving the availability of childcare.”*

In terms of the first recommendation, i.e. to improve incentives for older workers to stay in employment (pg. 10), only past measures are mentioned (except for a referral to the new programme period of the ESF). Concerning the second recommendation, i.e. improving education outcomes for vulnerable youth (pg. 10), measures that have already been implemented mostly start in 2008 and 2009. However, no plans for future measures are discussed.

With reference to the first point-to-watch, i.e. to achieve a balanced budget, the report refers to its strategy, without at this stage referring to the consequences of the financial crises and the expected downward pressure on the real economy (pg. 11). In terms of both *“increasing competition in services, in particular in professional services”* and *“identifying further emission reduction policies and measures”*, no reference is made to potential interactions with social inclusion. Education does of course play a role in terms of the point-to-watch *“strengthening entrepreneurship education”*. However, the report at this stage does not refer to inclusion policies or particularly disadvantaged people. Regarding the last point-to-watch, i.e. *“tackling the gender segregation of the labour market, including by further improving the availability of childcare”*, several (already implemented) measures are mentioned – with some references made to social aspects.

3.2. Feeding out

In this report, feeding out is interpreted as the contribution that growth and employment policies are making to achieving social inclusion objectives.

3.2.1. Employment and feeding out

Chapter V of the Austrian 2008-2010 NRP focuses on employment issues. Following a description of the *status quo* regarding key data for specific groups, the report summarizes (i)

³ http://ec.europa.eu/growthandjobs/european-dimension/200712-annual-progress-report/_index_en.htm

measures targeted to specific groups (pg. 33ff). It then continues with a section on (ii) life-long learning (pg. 38ff) and a section on (iii) principles regarding flexicurity (pg. 40ff).

- Measures targeted to specific groups

The parts of the section that refer to **measures targeted to specific groups** include employment measures for elderly workers, women, youth, and persons with disabilities or health problems. All of these four groups are of course relevant from a social inclusion perspective, given their over-proportional at-risk-of-poverty rates as well as their under-proportional employment rates. Two further – short – paragraphs in this first part of the section refer to security and health protection at the workplace and to the employment of non-EU-15-citizens.

Regarding elderly workers, the report formulates as its aim to reach the Stockholm target (i.e. in 2010, the employment rate of 55-64 year old should amount to 50%). Therefore, a multidimensional approach has been applied (pg. 33f). However, the social dimension of this mix of measures is not discussed. What is evident though, is a discrimination of elderly women in terms of the budget spent on them by the Austrian labour market service: Only 38.52 per cent of the budget for promotions was spent on elderly women in 2007. This rate ought to increase to 50 per cent.

Regarding female employment, an explicit aim is the reduction of the segmentation of the labour market in terms of (male and female) wages. Implemented measures to achieve this aim include (i) making it easier for women to enter non-traditional jobs and improving reconciliation of care work and employment. The flexibilisation of the childcare allowance is mentioned in this respect. An important initiative that would also help fighting the gender wage gap is changing the valuating work processes (*Arbeitsbewertungsverfahren*), which tend to pay for typically female proficiencies (such as specific skills) low wages and for typically male proficiencies (such as physical power) high wages. Further aims mentioned in the NRP include the Lisbon aim concerning the female employment rate (which has already been achieved) as well as the introduction of gender budgeting – without presenting further information on this important issue though. In terms of out-of-house childcare, the report only describes the *status quo* – without, however, discussing, which measures it wants to implement to reach the Barcelona objective.

Young adults are the third group, the NRP focuses on in the section on specific target groups (pg. 36f). Whereas it mentions a few of the measures introduced recently with quite some effects on the social inclusion of (disadvantaged) young people (e.g. education guarantee up until the age of 18), it does – at this stage of the report – not refer explicitly to the inclusion consequences of this approach. This also refers to the group of people with disabilities or health problems (pg. 37). While the stated aim is to raise the rate of disabled people entering the labour market, this is only viewed under the perspective of labour market integration – and not under the broader perspective of allowing for the social and economic inclusion of this group.

Regarding the short section of **safety and health protection at the workplace**, the stated aim is to maintain the health of all employees and thus to allow them to remain longer in the labour market. The (obvious) inclusion effect of this target is, however, not explicitly discussed.

The last section of the first part of Chapter V refers to the **employment of non-EU15-citizens** – a particularly sensitive topic in terms of social policy and, given the over-proportional rates of migrants at-risk-of-poverty, social inclusion. The focus in this section is, however, on migrant workers that are not part of the most disadvantaged groups, i.e. scientists and researchers as well as skilled personnel from the new EU members states, for whom it is now easier to enter the Austrian labour market. People with a migration background that either have no jobs or only low paid jobs in Austria are not mentioned at all in the report – even though the labour market integration of these groups of migrants would have implications on growth, employment and their social inclusion.

- Life-long learning

The section on life-long learning consists of two subsections. One refers to the development of the life-long learning strategy, which has been formulated after consultation with various actors, including the social partners and scientists. However, none of the five strategic guidelines refers to groups that are of particular relevance from a social inclusion perspective. Moreover, at this stage of the report, no explicit reference is made concerning the social dimension of life-long-learning.

The second subsection refers to education. Several of the (implemented) measures mentioned indeed refer to social aspects, such as the increase of out-of-house childcare or the improvement of the integration of children with specific needs. In addition, the New Middle school is mentioned, a pilot project for a school for all pupils aged between 10 and 14 years. While the report mentions that this enables a new, modern and performance-oriented education of all children that allows for equal chances, it does not further discuss the social dimension of this new school type. Further measures that are mentioned but not discussed any further in terms of their feeding out dimension include the extension of day-care (*Tagesbetreuung*) as well as measures to avoid dropout (pg. 38). Another important measure with quite some relevance for inclusion is that from this year onwards, it will be possible for apprentices to take school leaving examinations (*Matura*). This allows them to enter higher education.

In the context of the second country-specific recommendation, the section focuses once more on measures for disadvantaged young people (pg. 39f). It points to the introduction of an obligatory year of kindergarten for children with language problems, and to the promotion of children with non-German mother tongue at school. Once again, the report mentions the education guarantee up until the age of 18 – again, however, without discussing the feeding out dimension of this and the other measures explicitly. Moreover, future plans are not identified in addition to these already implemented measures.

- Joint flexicurity principles

The section on flexicurity (pg. 40ff) is maybe the one within Chapter V that includes social dimensions most explicitly. This refers to the 'flexicurity package' that has been installed in 2007 (pg. 40). It includes, for example, social security measures for the new self-employed, as well as a 'modernization' of conditions for the unemployed in terms of accepting a job (see

also above). Measures with a clear social dimension are also mentioned with regard to the four components of the flexicurity strategy (pg. 41ff). Among these four components, specific measures focus on disadvantaged people in terms of social inclusion (e.g. a dropout strategy, the education strategy up until the age of 18 (which has been mentioned also at previous stages of the report, but is only here related to those endangered by dropout)). An important measure is also noted on pg. 42, i.e. the possibility for dropouts to conclude compulsory education (*Hauptschulabschluss*), without, however, further discussing the potential feeding out aspects of this measure. Instruments concerning a modern system of social security as part of the flexicurity perspective, include, among others, the introduction of a minimum wage up until 2009 and the introduction of the means-tested minimum income scheme (*bedarfsorientierte Mindestsicherung*), which is, however, subject to implementation through a new government.

In the context of the flexicurity section, one subsection specifically refers to the social partners that have been part of both the development and the implementation of the flexicurity strategy. However, the report does not mention the integration of other stakeholders concerning these policies.

3.2.2. *Economic growth, financial sustainability and feeding out*

Chapter III of the Austrian 2008-2010 NRP illustrates macroeconomic policies, whereas Chapter IV refers to microeconomic policies. In Chapter III, there is hardly anything mentioned that refers to social aspects of the policies. On pg. 18, reference is made to the introduction of financial support for those in need of around-the-clock care, and the (subject to the implementation by the new government) new means-tested minimum income scheme. Moreover, reference is made to the extension of out-of-house childcare places. These measures are only discussed in this Chapter with regard to the financial compensation, which the Austrian provinces get from the nation state to fulfil their tasks.

A further aspect that is relevant from a social inclusion perspective is the high inflation rate in Austria, which is mainly caused by high energy, housing and food prices (see also above). The NRP states on pg. 20 that economic policy tries to combat inflation at its roots, and to diminish the negative consequences of high inflation for groups that are particularly disadvantaged. For that matter, the (old) government decided not to valorise contributions for administrative costs in 2008 (*Gebührenstopp*), and to allow for a raise of housing rents only on the basis of the average inflation rate for 2007 (rather than the much higher rate for December 2007). Further measures include an introduction of price monitoring concerning energy and food costs, as well as measures to enhance competition in these areas. The reduction of unemployment contributions for people on low earnings enhances their disposable income: It is projected that app. 1 million employees will benefit from this measure by receiving higher net earnings. The feeding out dimension of this measure is obvious, however, not discusses explicitly in this report.

Chapter IV, which focuses on reforms to enhance growth, only makes few references to the social dimensions of the described measures or strategies. For example, on pg. 24, the relevance of a good infrastructure for, among others, the welfare of private households is mentioned. On pg. 26f, the report states that deregulation must not lead to the corrosion of the high social policy and environment standards in Austria. The introduction of a voluntary unemployment insurance of the self-employed, which starts in 2009, is mentioned as well (pg. 27). Unemployed people, who want to become self-employed, are supported through various measures of the AMS. In addition to these measures, the Chapter includes a variety of further instruments and key areas it attempts to

focus at, without, however, referring to feeding out aspects – even though some would be more than obvious (e.g. reducing emissions within households, which might have a direct impact on the expenditures of (low-income) households (see pg. 29)).

Overall, therefore, references to feeding out aspects in the Chapters on growth and financial sustainability are more than meagre – and do not hold what is promised at the beginning of the NRP (pg. 4).

3.3. Feeding in

In this report, feeding in refers to the contribution that Austria's social inclusion policies and programmes are making to achieving the EU's growth and employment goals. In the context of the NRP, feeding in does not play much role. Only in Chapter VII, it is made clear in a very general statement that (i) policies for growth and employment must be coordinated with social protection and social inclusion policies, and that (ii) adequate, universally accessible and high-quality social protection systems as well as inclusive and activating inclusion policies support growth and employment in many ways (pg. 48).

The reduction of poverty through an increase of employment rates and an increase of purchasing power of lower-income groups is projected to activate consumption and thus affect both growth and employment. According to the report, the planned introduction of the minimum income scheme will not only help to reduce poverty but also enhance the inclusion of the recipients into the labour market and the society. Further areas, in which close correlations between social inclusion and growth and employment are identified, but not discussed in much length, include (i) investments in children and young people; (ii) a modern pension system; (iii) the promotion of health and health prevention; and (iv) the promotion of long-term-care at home (pg. 48f).

A similar approach to feeding in as in the NRP is also included in the 2008-2010 NSRSPSI: On pg. 8 of the Austrian 2008-2010 NSRSPSI, it is made clear that the social system has to be regarded as a productive force. Examples mentioned include combating child poverty (to break the intergenerational poverty cycle), a high employment participation (which reduces poverty and promotes growth through a higher supply of the labour force; in this context, it is mentioned that both decent work and minimum income regulations are key conditions for sustainably combating poverty) and health care.

3.4. Governance

3.4.1. Monitoring and assessment

So far, the Institute for Higher Studies (IHS) has been charged to evaluate the reform progress (pg. 6). This task has not been continued though – without explaining, why it has been stopped. Rather than evaluating the impact of the implemented reforms (and the NRP strategy), two research institutions, WIFO and IHS, have been asked to formulate proposals for the future of economic policy in Austria – based on best-practices from other EU member states. While this addition is a valid one, it should not substitute but accompany impact analyses, given that impact assessments have not been very prominent in Austria so far.

3.4.2. *Involvement of stakeholders*

A variety of different stakeholders has been invited to participate in the preparatory process of the NRP (pg. 3). Among them were several umbrella organizations of the Austrian nonprofit sector that have, for example, been invited to a preparatory meeting in May 2008. Moreover, they got the chance to comment jointly on an earlier version of the report. Given the heterogeneity of the Austrian nonprofit sector and the differences concerning targets, however, no joint comment has been produced. Rather, the Austrian poverty network (*Armutskonferenz*) as well as the Austrian Committee for Social Work (*Österreichisches Komitee für Soziale Arbeit, ÖKSA*) delivered their comments separately. The report does not state that it included these comments in any way, though.

The social partners, a further non-governmental stakeholder, have also been invited to contribute to the preparation of the NRP. In contrast to the NGOs, however, their comments – as well as one of their strategic papers – have been considered in the formulation of the report – as is explicitly made clear.

Further stakeholders that have been contacted in the preparatory process are the Austrian provinces. However, the report mentions that it will be necessary in the future to make the significance of the Lisbon process more visible at the regional level. This implies that the government felt that the provinces are not integrated (and/or informed) well enough.

One type of stakeholder that has not been invited to participate in the preparatory process are people experiencing poverty (PEP). Thus, it is recommended to integrate PEP in the next round of preparatory processes: This would particularly allow examining feeding in and feeding out perspectives in relation to social inclusion from their perspective.

Overall, it is necessary to intensify the cooperation with (non-governmental and regional) stakeholders, which should not only be invited to participate in the preparatory processes of the NRP, but also in the implementation of policies and in examining the impact of the policies.

3.4.3. *Coordination*

Even though not mentioned in the report, there has been some coordination between the ministries responsible for the social inclusion programme and the ministry responsible for the national reform strategy. From reading the report, though, the outcome of this coordination does not become clear. It still appears to me that feeding in and feeding out are seen as tasks that 'need' to be fulfilled in terms of reporting because the Commission wants it – and not because feeding in and feeding out are interpreted as useful exercises in preparing, implementing and evaluating measures from different policy fields by the ministries.

4. References

NRP 2005-2008: Republic of Austria (2005): Austrian Reform Programme for Growth and Employment. Vienna.

NRP 2008-2010: Republik Österreich (2008): Zweites Österreichisches Reformprogramm für Wachstum und Beschäftigung. Wien.

NSRSPSI 2008-2010: Republic of Austria (2008): National Strategy Report on Social Protection and Social Inclusion 2008-2010. Vienna.

Internet References

http://ec.europa.eu/growthandjobs/european-dimension/200712-annual-progress-report/_index_en.htm

http://www.statistik.at/web_de/static/vpi_aktuelle_werte_022832.pdf

http://www.statistik-austria.at/web_de/statistiken/preise/verbraucherpreisindex_vpi_hvpi/index.html

Annex

Table 1: Inflation rates Austria 2007-2008

VERBRAUCHERPREISINDIZES nächste Veröffentlichung: 14.11.2008

Monat	% zu Vorjahr	VPI 2005	VPI 2000	VPI 96	VPI 86	VPI 76	VPI 66	VPI I	VPI II	KHPI	LHKI (45)	LHKI (38)
Sep.07	2,1	103,8	114,8	120,8	158,0	245,6	431,0	549,1	550,9	4158,1	4824,7	4097,9
Okt.07	2,8	104,4	115,5	121,5	158,9	247,0	433,5	552,3	554,1	4182,2	4852,6	4121,6
Nov.07	3,1	104,9	116,0	122,1	159,7	248,2	435,5	554,9	556,7	4202,2	4875,9	4141,3
Dez.07	3,6	105,7	116,9	123,0	160,9	250,1	438,9	559,2	560,9	4234,2	4913,0	4172,9
Ø 07	2,2	103,7	114,6	120,6	157,8	245,2	430,4	548,3	550,1	4152,1	4817,8	4092,0
Jän.08	3,2	105,3	116,5	122,6	160,3	249,1	437,2	557,0	558,8	4218,2	4894,4	4157,1
Feb.08	3,2	105,6	116,8	122,9	160,7	249,8	438,5	558,6	560,4	4230,2	4908,4	4169,0
Mär. 08	3,5	106,4	117,7	123,8	161,9	251,7	441,8	562,9	564,7	4262,3	4945,6	4200,6
Apr.08	3,3	106,7	118,0	124,2	162,4	252,5	443,0	564,4	566,3	4274,3	4959,5	4212,4
Mai.08	3,7	107,4	118,8	125,0	163,5	254,1	445,9	568,1	570,0	4302,3	4992,1	4240,0
Jun.08	3,9	107,7	119,1	125,4	163,9	254,8	447,2	569,7	571,6	4314,4	5006,0	4251,9
Jul.08	3,8	107,6	119,0	125,2	163,8	254,6	446,8	569,2	571,0	4310,3	5001,4	4247,9
Aug.08	3,7	107,4	118,8	125,0	163,5	254,1	445,9	568,1	570,0	4302,3	4992,1	4240,0
Sept. 08 1)	3,7	107,6	119,0	125,2	163,8	254,6	446,8	569,2	571,0	4310,3	5001,4	4247,9

Q.: STATISTIK AUSTRIA. Erstellt am: 15.10.2008

1) Der Indexstand gilt bis zur Publikation des Indexwertes des folgenden Monats als vorläufige Zahl.

VPI 2005 Verbraucherpreisindex 2005, Basis 2005

VPI 2000 Verbraucherpreisindex 2000, Basis 2000

VPI 96 Verbraucherpreisindex 1996, Basis 1996

VPI 86 Verbraucherpreisindex 1986, Basis 1986

VPI 76 Verbraucherpreisindex 1976, Basis 1976

VPI 66 Verbraucherpreisindex 1966, Basis 1966

VPI I Verbraucherpreisindex durchschnittlicher Arbeitnehmerhaushalte (I), Basis 1958

VPI II Verbraucherpreisindex vierköpfiger Arbeitnehmerhaushalte (II), Basis 1958

KHPI Kleinhandelspreisindex, Basis: März 1938

LHKI (45) Lebenshaltungskostenindex für eine vierköpfige Arbeiterfamilie, Basis: April 1945

LHKI (38) Lebenshaltungskostenindex für eine vierköpfige Arbeiterfamilie, Basis: April 1938

Source: http://www.statistik-austria.at/web_de/statistiken/preise/verbraucherpreisindex_vpi_hvpi/index.html