

**Economic and Social Council**Distr.: General
22 May 2015

English only

Economic Commission for Europe

Conference of European Statisticians

Sixty-third plenary session

Geneva, 15-17 June 2015

Item 5 (c) of the provisional agenda

Recommendations for the 2020 Round of Population and Housing Censuses**Results of the consultation on the Conference of European Statisticians' Recommendations for the 2020 Censuses of Population and Housing****Note by the Secretariat***Summary*

The note summarizes the comments made by members of the Conference of European Statisticians (CES) on the *CES Recommendations for the 2020 Censuses of Population and Housing* (ECE/CES/2015/6/Add.1). The secretariat carried out the electronic consultation in March-April 2015.

A total of 58 countries and international organisations replied. The responding countries and organisations supported the endorsement of the recommendations.

Respondents also provided comments on the Recommendations. This note presents the substantive comments received, together with the replies of the UNECE Steering Group on Population and Housing Censuses, which include some suggestions for amendments to the Recommendations addressing the comments received.

In view of the support received, the *CES Recommendations for the 2020 Censuses of Population and Housing* are submitted to the Conference for endorsement, subject to the amendments presented in this note.

I. Introduction

1. This note summarizes comments made by members of the Conference of European Statisticians (CES) on the *CES Recommendations for the 2020 Censuses of Population and Housing*. The Secretariat carried out an electronic consultation on the recommendations in March-April 2015.
2. CES members were asked to structure their comments according to a set of questions on general and specific comments. The questionnaire used for the consultation also contained a set of questions on the national plans for the 2020 census round (Part 2, to be filled only by national statistical offices). The results of this part of the questionnaire are not presented in this note, but will be presented by UNECE at the September 2015 UNECE-Eurostat expert meeting on censuses, and will be used to plan future UNECE activities in this field.
3. The following 58 countries and international organisations replied to the consultation: Albania, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Eurostat, the Interstate Statistical Committee of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CISSTAT), and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). The United Nations Statistics Division submitted specific comments on text related to population bases, and the European Federation of National Organisations working with the Homeless (FEANTSA) submitted specific comments on text related to the enumeration of the homeless.

II. General comments

4. All responding countries and organisations supported the endorsement of the recommendations by CES¹.
5. All responding countries and organisations also indicated that the recommendations provide useful guidance on planning and conducting population and housing censuses, and on improving comparability of census results across countries¹.
6. Many countries acknowledged the value of the recommendations as the basis for their work in the field of censuses. General remarks of appreciation for the importance and usefulness of the recommendations and the high quality of the new revision were formulated by several countries including: Armenia, Australia, Finland, France, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Malta, Mexico, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Sweden, Tajikistan and United States.
7. Among the various general comments, Finland noted that “the new recommendations are comprehensive and especially the register-based censuses have been taken into account excellently”. Sweden also found it positive that the new

¹ Denmark did not reply to the question but specified that its census is compiled from administrative registers and complies with the Eurostat regulations on the subject.

recommendations have been more adapted to the situation of countries conducting a register-based census, expressing “hope that the development will continue, since more countries move towards using registers to a greater extent”. The United States noted that its census is mostly consistent with the CES Recommendations and the United Nations Statistics Division’s (UNSD) global Principles and Recommendations, and that they are particularly useful when collaborating with other national statistical offices (NSOs) to gain a broad general knowledge of census taking in the UNECE region and around the world.

8. Some countries, while supporting the adoption of the recommendations, made some general remarks or suggestions for improvement. Austria noted that in part 2 and 3 (on population and housing topics respectively), the situation of register-based census countries should be given greater consideration. Chile suggested that the document would be even more useful if the methodological aspects were presented in more detail. Germany observed that for European Union (EU) countries the needs and possibilities for delivering certain core-topics and non-core-topics are being discussed in the Eurostat Task Force on Future Censuses. Poland reminded that, as a EU member state, it is obliged to follow the European Commission Regulation on population and housing censuses concerning data sources, definitions and classifications of topics, but the CES Recommendations are useful for the topics that are not included in the legal documents for the EU member states. Poland also recognized that some difficulties with the international comparability of the data might arise.

III. Specific comments on various chapters of the Recommendations

9. Several countries also provided specific comments on various chapters of the Recommendations. The substantive comments are presented in this section, together with the responses by the Steering Group (SG) on Population and Housing Censuses, summarized at the end of each chapter.

A. Chapter I - Methodology

10. Chile suggested that the methodologies mentioned in the chapter require more detail, and noted that Latin American countries still use the traditional census method based on field enumeration, so further development of this issue would be recommendable.

11. Estonia noted that the text in para 39 on key user requirement criteria for census topics needs some clarification. In particular, the “strong and clearly defined user need” and “content that does not differ drastically from previous censuses” should be clarified. Estonia also proposed to add the following text to **Paragraph 39 (b)**:

(b) data on the topic are required for small population groups and/or at detailed geographical levels, and are expected to be used in multivariate analyses with other census topics, according to the confidentiality rules.

12. Ireland noted that the choice for countries between running a *de facto* or a *de jure* census needs to be explained, along with the benefits and disadvantages between the two, in the context of the different population counts.

13. Romania observed that more explanations and technical details about rolling census would be very useful.

14. The United States suggested the following amendments (new text is underlined, and words to be deleted are shown in strikethrough), clarifying the methodology of the United States census:

Paragraph 58: *There are three basic approaches to conducting a census, based on the method of data collection:*

(a)...

- *a traditional (short form) enumeration with annual updates of characteristics (long form data) on a sample basis (United States), and...*

Paragraph 89: *The survey samples a percentage of addresses each year to approximate a long form sampling rate over a ~~certain~~ period of ~~the census cycle, such as four or~~ five years.*

In the United States, where this approach has been implemented, the sample size is fixed at 3.54 million housing unit addresses which is a sampling rate of approximately 2.5 per cent. Annual sampling rates for the American Community Survey (ACS), depending on the size of the geographic area, at various geographic levels range from 0.51 per cent to 15 per cent. Over a five-year period, with the fixed sample size of 3.54 million housing unit addresses, the sampling rates range from 2.55 per cent to 75 per cent.

Paragraph 90: *Delete the sentence: ~~Three year estimates are produced for areas with populations of 20,000 or greater.~~*

Paragraph 91: *The survey data must be weighted ~~to the population totals~~ to produce reliable and useable estimates... This final weighting adjustment helps to ensure that estimates of the characteristics are comparable to official population estimates. ~~the standard periodic census.~~*

15. CISSTAT suggested adding the following sentence:

Paragraph 82: (at the end of paragraph) *The exception of it may be the traditional holidays (for example, "day of reindeer herder" in Russia) for the nomadic population, which is collected in certain places for a short period of time.* This sentence would represent an exception to the recommendation that traditional holidays are unsuitable times for the census enumeration.

1. Response by the Steering Group on Censuses

16. Concerning the comment by Chile and Romania, SG considers that the level of detail of the methodologies presented is adequate for the purpose of these recommendations, which cannot be as detailed as a technical manual. More detailed information on traditional censuses is available in UNSD's Principles and Recommendations, as already indicated in the Recommendations in paragraph 74.

17. Concerning the comments by Estonia, SG does not consider it necessary to further clarify the text in paragraph 39 (a) and (d). SG suggests adding the text:

Paragraph 39 (b): (at the end of paragraph) *...respecting data confidentiality principles.*

18. Concerning the comment by Ireland, SG suggests adding the following:

Paragraph 82: (at the end of paragraph) *Where a de facto Census is carried out it will be necessary to request each person enumerated away from home to state their usual residence address and code this address to a detailed level of geography to ensure that usually resident population counts can be calculated at a detailed level of geography. Usually resident persons who are abroad on Census night for a period of less than 12 months should also be counted. This can be achieved by requesting details of the person absent on Census night from the household.*

19. SG also suggests accepting the amendments proposed by United States and CISSTAT.

B. Chapter II - Technology

20. Colombia observed that the text on data capture devices presents the advantages and technical difficulties, however, no reference is made to the implications regarding the quality and use of the information. For example, it may be needed to significantly expand the collection period as it is not viable to have sufficient mobile capture devices to cover the country in a single day.

21. Estonia submitted the following comment: “Technologies for use would be useful, including descriptions of the various activities, and examples how to properly manage the census. Drivers for technological innovation are sufficient.”

22. Ireland commented that given the importance of the geographical dimension of census data, and the vital link between persons and dwellings, this section should address the issue of individuals responding to the census on their mobile device (on the train to work for example). As mobile devices become more prevalent, more and more countries readily facilitate mobile response. This may lead to the risk of fragmentation of the data, both in terms of a threat to the integrity of the concept of household, and to the vital link between the individual and the dwelling. This issue should be raised.

23. Romania suggested that it would be useful to provide more detailed explanations and country’s experiences with the use of new technologies.

1. Response by the Steering Group on Censuses

24. SG considers that the level of detail of the text presented in this chapter is adequate for the purpose of the Recommendations, which cannot be as detailed as a technical manual. Concerning the comment by Ireland, SG suggests adding the following underlined text:

Paragraph 196 (b): *Screen size may affect the ability of the enumerator to record and verify responses accurately. For the same reason, countries considering the option of Internet response with mobile devices should be aware of the risk of fragmentation of the data (with a threat to the integrity of the concept of household, and the link between the individual and the dwelling) due to the small size of the screens.*

C. Chapter III - Field and other operational activities

25. Ireland suggested that the recommendations should give some guidelines on publication timeliness, for example indicating what percentage of UNECE countries published their first results within one year of Census day in the 2010 round. This could be based on the result of the questionnaire sent to UNECE countries.

26. CISSTAT suggested the following amendment:

Paragraph 287: *...But young people, especially young men...*

1. Response by the Steering Group on Censuses

27. Concerning the suggestion by Ireland, SG considers that it would be difficult to give guidelines concerning the timeliness of the publication of the results, as this depends on various factors including the census method used. Moreover, the existence of trade-offs between timeliness of results and other dimensions of quality (see paragraphs 350-356)

seems to suggest that it is preferable not to give guidelines concerning timeliness. SG suggests accepting the amendment proposed by CISSTAT.

D. Chapter IV - Quality management

28. Colombia noted that in the text on operational quality control it is mentioned that quality errors, including coverage, should be detected and the corrective actions should be generated before the end of the collection phase; however, the mechanisms or tools to carry out these actions are not specified.

29. France suggested that it could be useful to get more operational advice to improve the quality of censuses, and possibly to promote exchange of experiences among countries on how to control the quality of the data produced.

30. Mexico observed that it would be useful to add additional examples of quality indicators to make it clear how to make the topic objective, and to be able to evaluate the census's quality.

1. Response by the Steering Group on Censuses

31. SG considers that the level of detail of the text presented in this chapter is adequate for the purpose of these recommendations. However, SG takes note of the fact that more guidance could be needed on census quality management, and recommends that technical guidelines in this field should be produced if possible.

E. Chapter V - Population bases

32. Austria and Latvia noted that in paragraph 410, after the first sentence, there is some text starting with "(b)", but there no previous text starting with "(a)", and suggested that the text starting with "(b)" should be possibly deleted.

33. Austria and the United Kingdom noted an inconsistency in the table on the place of residence for workers and students (Table 1 after paragraph 411). According to the table as it is, tertiary students studying abroad and returning home regularly should be included in the usually resident population of the country, but their place of usual residence within the country should be their term time address, which is actually outside the country. The United Kingdom noted that to be consistent with the global recommendations and the steer at the September 2014 Expert group meeting, students should be counted at their term-time address even if that is outside of the country of their family home to which they return regularly. The corresponding text at paragraph 411 should also be changed to be consistent with any amendments made in Table 1. The recommended reporting for workers is correct and should remain as presented.

34. Germany noted that in its country the registered place of residence will be used based on the regulations of the Federal Registration Act.

35. Romania noted that it would be preferable to explain better what is meant by the term "geographical place" in paragraph 397 (what does it mean: the locality, the exact address?). Moreover, the definitions of "continuous period of time" in paragraph 398 and of "virtual place" in paragraph 413 should be clarified.

36. The Russian Federation observed that in table 1 (after paragraph 411) the category of workers who work abroad and regularly do not return to family ('Regular' is taken to mean more than twice each month), are not enumerated by the place of their residence. However, work at gas and oil fields is performed on a rotational basis. The rotation may

last 1-2 months, after which the workers return to their family home and may either stay in their home country or return in 1-2 months. Therefore they are residing abroad for less than 12 months. Thus rotation workers should be enumerated in the country where they live with their families in case the workers are residing abroad for less than 12 months.

37. UNSD noted that the comparison between the text on population count, population base, and related concepts in the CES Recommendations (paragraphs 393-394) and the corresponding text in the *Principles and Recommendations (P&Rs) on Population and Housing Censuses – Revision 3* (paragraph 4.23) may create confusion. UNSD also specified the following: “The main inconsistency between two recommendations seems that the P&R uses the term of “population count or population base” for the population(s) which is/are derived from the enumerated population, while the UNECE defines the term of population base(s) as theoretical definitions which can be adopted by a country. Actually, it seems that definition of population count suggested by the UNECE/Eurostat is more coherent with the concepts of “population count or population base” given in the P&R, but this still needs to be confirmed. For Europe in which many countries use administrative registers in conducting population census, detailed population concepts might be needed and as a consequence definitions of some concepts might be to some extent different from the P&R. However, there is no explanation available in the UNECE document regarding how definitions of population concepts are related to the use of administrative registers, so that users of these documents would better interpret the differences.”

38. European Federation of National Organisations working with the Homeless (FEANTSA) observed that the notion of “vagrants” (in paragraph 412 (a)) is potentially stigmatizing, and suggested to remove it. FEANTSA also noted that the definition of homelessness covers an exhaustive range of living situations for people without a home, while the notion of ‘persons with no concept of usual residence’ is rather confusing. People ‘without a usual residence’ would be a more appropriate formulation.

1. Response by the Steering Group on Censuses

39. SG confirms that the text starting with “(b)” in paragraph 410, after the first sentence, was copied by mistake and should be deleted.

40. SG acknowledges the inconsistency in table 1 after paragraph 411, as noted by Austria and the United Kingdom. SG recommends correcting the table (and the text in paragraph 411) as suggested by the United Kingdom, so that students in tertiary education studying abroad should be counted at their term-time address (abroad) and therefore should not be included in the usually resident population of the country where their family lives. This correction would be in line with the global UNSD Principles and Recommendations, and with the decisions taken on this subject at the September 2014 UNECE-Eurostat Expert Meeting on Censuses.

41. Concerning the comments by Romania, SG clarifies that a definition of geographical place is given in paragraph 416, that “continuous period of time” means without interruption (except for short absences as specified in the third sentence of paragraph 398), and that “virtual place” should be intended as a virtual region of the country of departure, not corresponding to a real geographical region.

42. Concerning the comment by Russia, SG clarifies that if workers at gas or oil fields return home before one year of absence and they remain at their place for a relatively long period (such as 1-2 months), they should actually be considered as temporarily absent (the same way as a seasonal worker) and therefore included in the population of the family home country/region.

43. Concerning the comment by UNSD, SG considers that there is no inconsistency between the CES Recommendations and the Principles and Recommendations, but the text

of the CES Recommendations is simply more specific than the text in the P&R. The term “population count” in the CES Recommendations introduces and defines the difference with the population estimate. If there was no adjustment, and hence no population estimate, then the definition would be the same as in the P&R - this is also covered in 4.25 in the P&R. This is explained in the Charts 1 and 2 after paragraph 395 which also includes an adjustment.

44. SG suggests accepting the amendments proposed by FEANTSA.

F. Chapter VI - Geographic characteristics

45. Austria suggested that paragraph 426 (location of living quarters) could be moved to beginning of chapter VI, right after paragraphs 415 and 416, location of place of residence.

46. Estonia suggested adding a clarification to the following text:

Paragraph 421: *Localities, as defined above, should not be confused with the smallest civil divisions of a country. In some cases, the two may coincide.*

47. France, with reference to paragraph 438 on using grid statistics, suggested adding a reference to the fact that there is a question of significance of the data, especially when the data come from a sample like in the rolling census.

1. Response by the Steering Group on Censuses

48. SG does not consider necessary moving paragraph 426 after paragraph 416, or providing further clarification in paragraph 421. Concerning the comment by France, SG suggests amending the text in as follows:

Paragraph 438: *...However, grid statistics may give rise to concerns over confidentiality or significance of the data in thinly populated areas, or when data come from a sample source...*

G. Chapter VII - Demographic characteristics

49. Australia suggested, for the non-core topic ‘total number of children born alive’ (paragraphs 480-482), that it may be useful to add a note regarding the potential sensitivity of this topic for mothers who have experienced still-births so that this can be considered in the testing programme. There may also be data quality issues due to the potential inclusion of adopted children or exclusion of children adopted out, despite instructions to the contrary.

50. Austria made the following comments:

(a) **Paragraph 462** (Age) says *...Date of birth also allows the calculation of age made in respect of points in time other than at census reference day.* However, paragraph 396 states that the “census day/period” is the day/period on/during which a census is carried out and should not be confused with the census reference time.

(b) **Paragraph 470:** (Legal marital status, alternative classification): *If “registered or other legal partnership” is introduced, the equivalent categories of widowed and divorced should also be added: “registered partnership ended with the death of partner” and “registered partnership legally dissolved”.*

(c) **Paragraph 477:** (De facto marital status): the proposed distinction within category (1.0) between (1.1) “Persons living with opposite-sex spouse or partner” and (1.2) “Person living with same-sex spouse or partner” does not provide separate data on

“marriages” and “cohabitations”. The proposed distinction only provides separate data on persons living in a heterosexual and same-sex partnership. Separate data on “marriages” and “cohabitations” are provided by cross-tabulating de facto marital status with legal marital status. In our opinion, further distinctions of the de facto marital status are unnecessary.

51. Mexico reported that in its census only the “marital status” (and not the legal marital status) is collected, because what matters is the *de facto* status, not *de jure*.

52. Slovakia expressed dissatisfaction because its recommendation for the classification of *de facto* marital status (paragraph 474) was not accepted. Slovakia had proposed to distinguish the spouses and the partners because the traditional families are still the basis for human society, and added a comment that: “Families have gone through major changes in recent decades, therefore we need data with high informative value, which are usable for analysis of family behaviour and subsequently for population and family policies. Moreover, in many countries these data are available only from the census survey. So, we still do not consider mixing the marriages and the cohabitations as good practice.”

1. Response by the Steering Group on Censuses

53. Concerning the comment by Australia, SG suggests adding the following sentence:

Paragraph 481: (at the beginning of paragraph) *Countries should be aware of the potential sensitivity of this topic for mothers who have experienced still-births. This issue should be carefully considered in the testing programme...*

54. Concerning the comments by Austria, SG suggests amending the text as follows:

Paragraph 462: *...Date of birth also allows the calculation of age made in respect of points in time other than at census reference ~~day~~ time.*

Paragraph 470: *Alternatively, one example of how the classification at paragraph 467 may be expanded is: ~~to include:~~...*

Paragraph 477: *An optional distinction ... might be considered by countries that would like to produce ~~separate data on ‘marriages’ and ‘cohabitations’~~ more detailed data for the purposes...*

55. Concerning the comment by Slovakia, SG noted that the proposal by Slovakia was discussed at the September 2014 UNECE-Eurostat Expert meeting on censuses, but there was limited support and it was not accepted. The proposal by Slovakia included a cross-classification of categories of legal and de facto marital status, and the participants considered that it was preferable to keep the two topics separate.

H. Chapter VIII - Economic characteristics

56. Austria observed that presenting the definition of “place of work” in a box (paragraph 555) is misleading, since it will appear to be a topic which it is not. “Location of place of work” is the topic which refers to the geographical location (paragraph 445). Austria proposed to include the definition of place of work into the box of the current paragraph 557 (and making a reference to paragraph 445-450) and to delete paragraph 556.

57. Estonia, with reference to text on the 2013 ICLS Resolution, requested clarification concerning the underlined text:

Box 1 (after paragraph 491): *...the updated international standards would ideally be implemented over time..., and suggested adding a timetable concerning the text: ...During the transition period, it is of utmost importance that the institutions...*

58. Malta noted that, further to the feedback received during the March 2015 Meeting of the Eurostat Task Force on the Future EU Censuses, the category ‘Members of producers cooperatives’ in the core topic ‘Status in employment’ (paragraph 543), will no longer be required at EU level and Malta will probably not include it in the next census.

58. Romania made the following comments:

(a) The whole chapter is based on the criteria of “previous 7 days”, which makes impossible to use information included in administrative data sources (especially criteria used for definition of unemployed persons). In other words, it will not be possible to determine indicators about economic participation of people at the smallest territorial levels for countries which intend to carry-out census without field data collection.

(b) It is not specified whether the variable “place of work” (paragraph 555) is a core or non-core topic.

(c) The topics on income (paragraphs 574 – 586) are not directly linked with censuses’ objectives; they increase the respondent burden and can compromise the whole data collection involving very sensitive issues as level and sources of income. There are other specialized sample surveys which estimate the level of income. In order to produce comparable statistics, a common classification of socio-economic groups is needed.

1. Response by the Steering Group on Censuses

59. SG proposes to remove the box from paragraph 555, as proposed by Austria, to make clear that “place of work” is not a census topic. SG does not consider necessary to move the definition of place of work or to modify the text of paragraphs 555-556.

60. SG considers that the text in Box 1 does not need further clarification, as “the updated international standards” refers clearly to the recommendations of the 2013 ICLS Resolution, and no timetable can be specified for the transition period.

61. Concerning the comments by Romania, SG notes that the text has been revised keeping in mind that some countries use administrative data for their census; “place of work” (paragraph 555) is not a census topic (the box will be removed to avoid the misunderstanding); the two non-core income topics in some countries are considered not suitable for the census for the reasons mentioned by Romania, but in other countries are commonly accepted as census topics; no common classification of socio-economic groups is provided as there is no international standard classification, and because countries considering this topic are likely to adopt a classification that takes into account the national circumstances.

I. Chapter IX - Agriculture

62. Australia suggested that it could be useful for the chapter to include examples of how the two censuses could be linked in developed countries where agriculture is not confined to the household sector, including examples of how the issue of the different enumeration units in the two censuses (business vs household) could be overcome.

1. Response by the Steering Group on Censuses

63. SG notes that various examples of country practices are presented in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) *Guidelines for Linking Population and Housing Censuses with Agricultural Censuses*, mentioned in paragraph 598 and footnote 43.

J. Chapter X - Educational characteristics

64. Estonia noted that the purpose of the following text is not clear (in the context of the topic educational attainment):

Paragraph 609: *Countries should also consider collecting further information that captures data on levels of education not successfully completed. This may be achieved by asking whether a higher level than the one attained has been started and interrupted, or studies are ongoing at the higher level. Alternatively, a question on the highest grade completed may be appropriate in this context.*

65. Mexico commented that school attendance should be a core topic, specifically for people under 21, since education is a fundamental right.

1. Response by the Steering Group on Censuses

66. With regard to the comment by Estonia, the SG clarified that the text refers to education levels and education grades (within levels). For the topic of educational attainment, countries should collect with priority data on the highest education level successfully completed. In addition, they may also collect data (on an optional basis) on education level not successfully completed. As an alternative, data could be collected on the highest grade completed (from which information can be derived on the education levels successfully completed or not completed).

67. School attendance was proposed and agreed by UNECE countries as a non-core topic at the 2013 and 2014 expert meetings, and no proposals were made to consider it as a core topic.

K. Chapter XI - Migration

68. Colombia noted that the text of the Recommendations refers to the difficulties encountered in obtaining the information regarding persons who migrate abroad (for instance in paragraph 402 in the chapter on population bases), but it does not present any recommendation or development on the subject, which would be useful to include.

69. Estonia suggested adding a new topic on the place of birth of grandparents. Based on this information it would be possible to identify the third generation of migrants.

70. Germany made the following comments, related to the German census:

(a) For the country of citizenship, dependent territories cannot be identified;

(b) Internal migration: For people born in the country the information about the “place of birth” cannot be determined at the level of the smallest civil division;

(c) The topic “previous place for usual residence and date of arrival in the current place” can only be implemented in the reduced mode.

71. Ireland observed that, regarding internal migration (paragraphs 680 – 691), clarity is required around the use of ‘reduced mode’ and whether or not there is a requirement to collect month of arrival in such circumstances.

72. Malta asked to clarify what is meant by ‘smallest civil division’ referred to in the variable ‘Place of birth’, adding that if it refers to the actual municipality or similar level of detail about where the birth took place, this is not available in Malta.

73. Mexico noted that in their country it is considered preferable to collect data on place of residence at a specific date (1, 3 or 5 years before the census) rather than the previous

place of residence, as the respondent has difficulty remembering the accurate date of arrival.

74. Romania noted that in order to strengthen the international comparisons, it would be preferable to propose two alternative approaches, at least for core topics (i.e. country of birth). The definition and use of unique classifications and nomenclatures would also be preferable.

1. Response by the Steering Group on Censuses

75. With regard to the comment from Colombia, SG suggests to add in paragraph 402 a reference to the document “Measuring Emigration at the Census: lessons learned from four country experiences” (<http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/stats/documents/ece/ces/ge.41/2008/11.e.pdf>)

76. Concerning the comment by Estonia, SG considers that collecting information on the place of birth of grandparents in a census would be complex, and the quality of the information collected could often not be sufficiently good.

77. Concerning the comment by Ireland, SG clarifies that under the reduced mode only the place of usual residence one year prior to the census has to be considered.

78. Concerning the comment by Malta, the smallest civil division can vary from country to country, but in many countries it is the municipality.

79. Concerning the comment by Romania, SG clarifies that in a few cases the recommendations propose two alternative approaches when it was not possible to have a common agreement on one of the two approaches. On country of birth, for instance, a number of countries supported the principle of the place where the birth occurred, while others supported the principle of the place of residence of the mother at the time of the census.

L. Chapter XII - Ethno-cultural characteristics

80. Chile suggested that the chapter should outline the scope of Convention No. 169 concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in independent countries, International Labour Organization (ILO).

81. Mexico commented that ethnicity should be a core topic because in most of the cases ethnic minorities are vulnerable people who require attention by the state.

1. Response by the Steering Group on Censuses

82. SG considers that the convention mentioned by Chile is mostly not relevant in CES member countries that are the main target of the CES Recommendations. For the comment by Mexico, SG notes that in many CES countries ethnicity is considered a sensitive topic not suitable for the census, and in some countries it would not be possible by law to collect this information. Therefore it should be considered as a non-core topic.

M. Chapter XIII - Disability

83. Russian Federation observed that the text on disability is not easy to understand and should be presented in a more user-friendly style.

84. Serbia noted that specific instructions on collecting data on disability among the youngest population are missing in the chapter. Recommendations on how to distinguish

between a child who develops in accordance with its age and a child with greater risk for experiencing restrictions in performing specific tasks or participating in role activities, which was discussed at a meeting in September 2014, would enable improvement of data quality and ensure unified approach of all countries.

1. Response by the Steering Group on Censuses, after consultation with the Washington Group on Disability Statistics

85. Concerning the comment by the Russian Federation, SG recognizes that the text on disability is presented in a relatively technical style, due to the sensitivity and complexity of the subject. Further guidance, especially for countries with limited experience in collecting disability data in the census, is available on the website of the Washington Group on Disability Statistics, referenced in the recommendations. Concerning the comment by Serbia, SG suggests the following amendments to the text:

Paragraph 761: *...The disability questions should be addressed to each single household member aged 5 years and above and general questions on the presence of persons with disabilities in the household should be avoided. For children 2-4 years of age, only the domains seeing, hearing and walking would be considered suitable, while no questions are suitable for the population 0-2 years of age. If necessary, a proxy respondent can be used to report for the family member who is incapacitated or temporarily absent...*

N. Chapter XIV - Household and family characteristics

86. Austria suggested moving paragraph 849 to the beginning of chapter XIV, after paragraph 780, because the issue of how to make a distinction between institutional and private households is addressed. Austria agrees, however, that there is a connection to “single or shared occupancy”.

87. Austria also suggested that the text for the classification of topic “single or shared occupancy” should be corrected as follows since it applies to housing units (which include conventional dwellings and other housing units):

Paragraph 847: *The following classification of private households living in conventional dwellings and other housing units by single or shared occupancy is suggested for countries using the housekeeping unit concept of households:*

(1.0) Households living alone in a ~~dwelling~~ housing unit

(2.0) Households sharing a ~~dwelling~~ housing unit with one or more other households

88. Germany noted that in their country for the core-topic ‘household status’ the information about ‘primary homeless persons’ cannot be determined.

89. Romania commented that the classification for the topic ‘family status’ is very detailed and increases the respondents’ burden. Romania also observed that for the majority of the topics information cannot be produced in a census without field data collection.

90. Russian Federation noted that the definition of “extended family” in paragraph 793 (“...group of two or more persons who live together in the same household and *who do not constitute a family nucleus...*”) seems in contradiction with the text for topics “extended family status” (paragraph 822) and “type of extended family” (paragraph 835), where various types of extended families actually include family nuclei. Russia also suggested to add to the classification of “household status” (paragraph 811) a new item (1.2.4) - person living with relatives and non-relatives.

91. FEANTSA (European Federation of National Organisations working with the Homeless) advised not to use the terms “transients” (paragraph 783) and “rootless” (in paragraph 782 (2.9), which are stigmatizing. Sticking to primary and secondary homelessness would be preferable. FEANTSA suggests the following reformulations:

Paragraph 782 (2.0): *...This category includes persons with no place of usual residence who ~~move frequently between~~ make use of various types of accommodations (including dwellings, shelters, institutions for the homeless or other living quarters) and ~~but who at least~~ have a roof over their heads at the time of the census.*

1. Response by the Steering Group on Censuses

92. SG suggests accepting the two proposals by Austria. Paragraph 849 should be moved after paragraph 780, but a cross-reference to the same paragraph should be included in the topic “single or shared occupancy”.

93. With regard to the comment by Romania about the difficulty in producing the information for the topics in this chapter in a census without field data collection, SG notes that several countries with register-based censuses commented that the new draft recommendations adequately address the needs of their type of census, and did not report any specific problems for the topics in this chapter.

94. SG agrees with the comments made by the Russian Federation and suggests revising the corresponding text as follows:

Paragraph 793: *...It is recommended that an ‘extended family’ be defined for census purposes as a group of ~~two or more~~ persons who live together in the same household, including one or more family nuclei and other persons who do not constitute a family nucleus as defined above but are related to each other or to any members of any family nuclei in the same household (to a specified degree) through blood, marriage or adoption...*

95. SG also agrees with the Russian Federation’s suggestion to add to the classification of “household status” (paragraph 811) a new item (1.2.4) - person living with relatives and non-relatives.

96. SG suggests accepting the amendments proposed by FEANTSA.

O. Chapter XV - Housing characteristics

97. Austria noted that in footnote 2 of Table 3 (after paragraph 876) the reference to enumeration unit “H=households” should be deleted, since in the table there are no topics relevant for this enumeration unit. Moreover, in some paragraphs, the term “at the time of the census” is used, while it would be more appropriate to use the term “census reference time” used in chapter V “Population Bases”. Austria also suggested integrating the text of paragraphs 882-884 into one paragraph, with the following editorial revision:

Paragraph 882 (summarizing 882-884): *Conventional dwellings can be classified as being: occupied; of seasonal or secondary use; vacant; or having only persons who are not included in the census present.*

(a) A conventional dwelling is classified as an “occupied conventional dwelling” if it is a usual residence of one or more persons regardless of temporary absences at the census reference time such as holidays or stay in a hospital. An “occupant” of a conventional dwelling is a person who has usual residence in the dwelling.

(b) A conventional dwelling which is “reserved for secondary or seasonal use is classified as such even if the dwelling is temporarily occupied at the census reference time

by persons who are usually resident in another dwelling (an example is given in paragraph 912).

(c) A conventional dwelling is defined as being “vacant” if it is unoccupied because it is either for sale or rent, abandoned, due for demolition, or newly built and not yet occupied.

(d) A conventional dwelling is defined as a dwelling with persons not included in the census if the dwelling is (temporarily) occupied only by persons who are not included in the census such as visitors, short-term migrants, foreign military, naval and diplomatic personnel and their families.

1. Response by the Steering Group on Censuses

98. SG suggests accepting the proposals by Austria.

IV. Conclusion

99. All responding countries and organisations supported the endorsement of the recommendations.

100. The comments and views expressed during the electronic consultation were carefully reviewed by the UNECE Steering Group on Censuses. In many cases the Steering Group recommends amendments to the Recommendations to address the issues raised by the countries and organisations. In other cases the Steering Group provides clarifications or explains why there is no need to amend the Recommendations.

101. In view of the wide support expressed by countries and organisations, the Conference is invited to endorse the recommendations, subject to amendments presented in this document, and to the outcomes of the discussion at the CES plenary session.
