

**Working paper No.5
8 December 2005**

ENGLISH ONLY

**STATISTICAL COMMISSION and
ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR
EUROPE**

**STATISTICAL OFFICE OF THE
EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES
(EUROSTAT)**

**CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN
STATISTICIANS**

**Joint UNECE/EUROSTAT Meeting on
Population and Housing Censuses
Organised in cooperation with UNFPA
(Geneva, 12-16 December 2005)**

Supporting paper

**SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT VERSION OF THE
CES RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE 2010 CENSUSES OF POPULATION AND
HOUSING**

Note prepared by UNECE

Introduction

1. The purpose of this note is to present substantive comments on the draft version of the “CES Recommendations for the 2010 Censuses of Population and Housing” submitted to the UNECE by representatives of countries and international organisations. This note is intended to support the discussion on the draft census recommendations and raise the attention on specific points.
2. The following countries have submitted comments: Austria, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, Norway, Spain, Turkey, and the United Kingdom. Comments were also submitted by the International Labour Organization (ILO) and the Director of the UNECE Statistical Division.
3. The comments are presented sorted by chapter of the draft recommendations and, when relevant, by census topics. Editorial comments submitted to the UNECE are not presented in this note but will be taken into account in the finalisation of the census recommendations.

1. Census Methodology [including Appendices II to VIII]

Para. 1. Introduction to Chapter 1

Comment by the Director of the UNECE Statistical Division:

4. This paragraph should be dropped or redrafted. The reference to the Principles and Recommendations should be deleted from this paragraph (a reference is in the section “Relation to the 2010 UN World Programme” in the Introduction to the recommendations. . The reference to chapter 2 on census technology should also be removed.

Para. 5. Non-statistical functions of a census (implications and risks)

Comment by INE (Spain):

5. The issue of the risks associated with the use of the census to update the population registers is very important, so it deserves a more complete assessment. It’s completely true that this risk exist.... but must be compared with the disadvantages of the opposite:

a) Permitting census population and population register (PR) counts diverge indefinitely may bring about confusion to the users, and reduce the statistical utility of the register.

b) To trust indefinitely in the PR counts without any periodical check against reality has several, very tempting, advantages (drastic reduction of census costs and respondent burden) but also a potentially very negative consequence: that population figures, as time goes by and cumulative errors grow, may become very apart from true figures.

6. So, each country having a PR should weigh up the relative advantages and disadvantages and decide whether it’s advisable a two-way relationship between census and PR or not. In case of opting for doing so, some technical and legal aspects become very important:

- Specific legislation governing the PR should contain explicitly this use of census operation for improving and updating the PR information.

- The different nature of PR information, with administrative and statistical purposes, and the rest of census data, only with statistical purposes, must be clearly explained in the questionnaires. Separated sheets for PR information may help to emphasize this essential distinction.

- All along the processing, a proper separation between the two types of information must be assured; for instance, files containing personal identifications should never contain statistical non-PR variables.

Comment by the Director of the UNECE Statistical Division:

7. The following revised text is proposed for paragraph 5: “Some countries use the census operations not only to collect statistical information for the census but also to collect the same or other types of information on individuals or households for administrative use. The most common use of the census operation for administrative purposes is the creation or updating of administrative population registers, be they central, regional or local. This type of approach has the advantage of being cost-effective. However, it has to be carefully weighed against the possible negative impact on response behavior, since such a combination violates one of the Fundamental Principles of Official

Statistics stating that “individual data collected by statistical agencies ...are to be used exclusively for statistical purposes” (See appendix iii). The use of the census operations for administrative purposes may have a negative impact on the trust of the people on the neutrality of the census and ultimately can affect the quality of the results.”

Para. 8 Definition of housing census

Comment by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom):

8. The last two sentences are not necessary true. Demographic characteristics of the population are not a prerequisite for measuring quality of housing conditions. For example, information relating to tenure, number of rooms and heating of the accommodation etc are not dependent on the characteristics of population living there. And by definition information about vacant accommodation does not even relate to a resident population.

Comment by the Director of the UNECE Statistical Division:

9. The last sentences should be removed and possibly included in para. 9.

Para. 10.6 Essential features of population and housing censuses – Independent quality check

Comment by INE (Spain):

10. In our opinion, this is not an essential characteristic that helps to define **what it is** a census, but a methodological issue or a desirable quality of a good census, as many others.

11. Moreover, the term ‘independent’ may be interpreted as the classical *a posteriori* evaluation of coverage and this is not always the best solution: it may be better to include the coverage check results in the population figures from the very beginning (for example, British *One Number Census*; Spanish 2001 figures also took into account from the start all the information that could be useful to decide whether to count every person or not).

12. The experience with our users is clear about it: they already know that census figures contain, as any other statistical operation, certain errors, of various kinds and implications. So, what they ask is that we make our job as best as possible and manage to reduce these errors as much as we can... but that, once published the first collection of results (better the sooner), no significant correction get published later. Instead of this, publishing a second although somehow ‘better’ collection of figures, if quite different from the first ones, is usually very bad received by them.

Para. 12 Criteria for census topics

Comment by the Director of the UNECE Statistical Division:

13. Criterion 3 should be moved before criterion 2. Criterion 4 should be “the topic is of major national importance and relevant at the local level”.

Para. 17 Core and non-core topics

Comment by the Director of the UNECE Statistical Division:

14. The criteria for identifying core and non-core topics should be discussed at the meeting.

Para. 19 The relation between censuses and sample surveys

Comment by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom):

15. The following revised text is proposed for the last sentence in para. 19: "Sampling, in turn, is a much more recent technique, dating back..."

Para. 21 Long forms

Comment by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom):

16. Do we need to make specific cross-references to text quoted from in the previous recommendations (for example ref. 6). After all, much of the text of the recommendations repeats what we said last time.

Para. 22 Long forms

Comment by the Director of the UNECE Statistical Division:

17. The first sentence should be modified to read: "The use of long and short form has made it possible..."

Para. 23 The census as benchmark and frame

Comment by the Director of the UNECE Statistical Division:

18. The following text is suggested: "The value of either a population or a housing census is increased if the results can be used with the results of other DATA COLLECTIONS. These could take the form of use of the census data as a basis or benchmark for ~~current~~ statistics IN THE SAME FIELD, or to furnish the information needed for conducting other statistical investigations. It can, for example, provide a statistical frame for other ~~censuses or~~ sample surveys OR AN AGRICULTURE CENSUS. The population census is also important in developing the population estimates needed to calculate vital rates from civil registration data. In addition, these censuses are a major source of data used in official compilations of social indicators, particularly on topics that usually change slowly over time."

Para 25 The census as a frame

Comments by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom):

19. The concept of a probability sample design has not previously been introduced.

20. The following revised text is proposed: "It may be a list of structures, addresses, household, or persons" ... "Indeed, many countries use their census for such purposes subject to confidentiality constraints."

21. Suggest new paragraph at "It is important...". This sentence does not make the point effectively. All censuses must be at least one or two years old when the results are out. What we are trying to say here is that 'information from any census - but particularly those in a rapidly changing or growing country - will be out of date and may not always be suitable as a frame. Alternatively we could say. ' It is important to recognise that any census - even one that is just one or two years old - may not be suitable...!'

Para. 29 Additional census inputs to intercensal survey programmes

Comment by the Director of the UNECE Statistical Division:

22. The paragraph is difficult to understand.

Para. 29.a The relation between population and housing census and the agricultural census

Comment by the State Statistical Office of Estonia:

23. As we know Eurostat is planning to have 2011 as a reference year but Agricultural Census is supposed to be at 2010. If reading these recommendations, it can be assumed that Population Census will be conducted before agricultural census.

Comment by the Director of the UNECE Statistical Division:

24. The link between the population census and the agricultural census is relevant only when the majority of agricultural activity is in the household sector.

Para. 29.c

Comment by the Director of the UNECE Statistical Division:

25. The following sentence could be deleted: "To get a complete picture, agricultural data users will need both agricultural census data and data from the population census to meet their needs."

Para. 30 Methodology approaches in the ECE region

Comment by the Director of the UNECE Statistical Division:

26. The following approaches should be listed (the first three are based on field operations):
1. The universal enumeration based on field operations at a given moment and exhaustive collection of all characteristics (traditional method);
 2. The universal enumeration based on field operations at a given moment and collection of selected characteristics on a sample basis (long/short form);
 3. The universal enumeration based on field operations at a given moment and with yearly updates of characteristics on a sample basis;

4. The method of using only registers and administrative sources;
 5. The method of using a combination of registers and administrative sources and surveys (complete enumerations or sample surveys).
27. The text in appendix 2 should be amended accordingly.

Para. 40 Confidentiality

Comment by the Director of the UNECE Statistical Division:

28. In the section on confidentiality, it should be mentioned that 1) names should be removed as soon as possible; 2) PIN should be separated from other data, and should not be released.

Para. 42 Confidentiality

Comment by the Director of the UNECE Statistical Division:

29. Item 42.a (“swapping of some records...”) should be removed. In item 42.d the words “randomly modifying or” should be removed, so that the text reads: “rounding data before the statistics are released”

Para. 59 Purpose of census evaluation

Comment by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom):

30. Delete opening " As in the past". There is a third general source of error – processing errors. We need to say something about these.

Paragraphs 64-68 Outsourcing

Comment by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom):

31. We might consider noting here the reasons why NSIs might want to outsource certain parts of the census operation, eg cost, lack of expertise, risk management etc. Or merge with the outsourcing section in Chapter 2 which does talk about reasons.

Comments by the Director of the UNECE Statistical Division:

32. The term "outsourcing" in the all section should be replaced by "subcontracting". Furthermore, it should be clearly mentioned that the subcontractor(s) should work under strict confidentiality rules.

33. The first sentence in para. 64 should be redrafted to read: “The subcontracting of components of census operations still requires the census agency to take FULL responsibility for ~~and manage~~ the quality of the census data....”

Parag 72 Dissemination

Comments by the Director of the UNECE Statistical Division:

34. It should be mentioned that census results should be disseminated simultaneously to all users.

Paragraph 81 Publicity and information campaign

Comments by the Director of the UNECE Statistical Division:

35. The campaign should highlight that the census is part of official statistics.

Appendix II: Alternative Approaches to Census-taking

Comment by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom):

36. Appendix II requires some further work. There is an imbalance between the amount of attention given to traditional censuses compared with register-based approaches. This Appendix needs to be written in a more objective way. For instance, in the section on register-based censuses there are only two paragraphs on the disadvantages (paras 698 and 699) compared to various pages on the advantages.

Comment by INE (Spain):

37. We drafted a description of the census type consisting in a combination of administrative registers and a complete enumeration, to be included in Appendix II: Alternative Approaches to Census-taking (see Annex to this document). The description was drafted following the same structure used for describing the other approaches presented in this appendix.

Paragraph 661 Traditional census

Comments by the Director of the UNECE Statistical Division:

38. The approach mentioned in para. 661 is difficult to handle!

Paragraph 664

Comments by the Director of the UNECE Statistical Division:

39. It should be mentioned that the level of security should allow enumerators to reach all parts of the country safely.

Paragraph 694 Register based census

Comments by INE (Spain):

40. In our opinion, strictly register-based censuses, apart from its obvious and very important advantages, presents also several disadvantages that, for a more complete assessment of the different census types, should be explicitly mentioned:

41. Registers information gives rise to rights and duties. So, they are prone to contain, to some degree, 'convenient information' more than 'true information'. For instance, PR address is not always the usual residence, even though legislation provides so, but the residence that brings the best balance between rights and duties among all the possible choices for every person.

42. Trusting indefinitely in the reliability of PR counts without any kind of periodical check, even one every ten years, is risky, because of cumulative errors that, to more or less extent, every PR inevitably contains. Difficulties in measuring, accurately, the departures from the country is, perhaps, the best example.

2. Emerging Census Technology

Paragraphs 88-89

Comment by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom):

43. We use the term 'Census managers' here to mean NSI, but do not use the term in this context elsewhere. Census managers can also be taken to mean 'field managers' (such as in para 112) and I think we should be clear what we mean here.

Para. 91

Comment by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom):

44. The following revised text is proposed: "In some countries there are legislative provisions to allow citizens to conduct...". "Even without such provisions, growing..."

Paragraphs 93-98 Outsourcing

Comment by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom):

45. We could perhaps combine this section with the section on Outsourcing in Chapter 1. Some of the reasons for considering outsourcing are set out here.

Paragraphs 101 Internet return of forms

Comment by INE (Spain):

46. The effect of implementing an Internet (or telephone) option on the costs depends heavily on the way all the collection methods are combined. **The key point is whether the costs of obtaining some significant percentage of households by a cheap per person method** (like internet or telephone) **can be subtracted from the total costs of collection or not.** For instance, in Singapore 2000, first two available methods were only Internet and telephone and this allowed to reduce the number of, finally necessary, enumerators from 600 to 60. On the contrary, if enumerators, or the use of mail, were simultaneous to internet and the telephone, and this implied that the number of enumerators were calculated as 'if they were going to collect it all', no saving would be possible, of course.

3. Geographic Characteristics

Para 136 Introduction

Comment by INE (Spain):

47. Effectively, this recommendation is quite important. Each person should have only one place of usual residence, specially in an international context, but is precisely in this international context where is most difficult to ensure this. Therefore, if a person fill in the census questionnaire in two different countries as a person living in the country, how can we detect it? If a person is not living in the country anymore but we have enough information to count it, is very difficult for us to know if it's being counted in another country. That's why it would be very useful to get recommendations to avoid these duplications in two different countries.

Para 137-140 Place of usual residence

Comment by Statistics Norway:

48. In Norway, the registered place of residence is based on a six months criterion for duration of intended stay, rather than the recommended twelve months criterion.

Comment by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom):

49. The UK still has some concerns about adopting the '12-months concept' universally to establish usual residence. In para.140.4 for example, the document recommends that where the person spends the majority of the year should be taken as the place of usual residence. This is, in effect, a '6-months concept', and we wonder why this same criterion cannot be universally adopted in establishing usual residence. This is clearly an area of some ambiguity which may require further discussion.

Para. 140.2/3 Place of usual residence – Treatment of students

Comment by the Statistical Service of Cyprus:

50. In paragraph 140 point 3 recommends that by convention third level students should consider their term time address as their place of usual residence regardless of whether they are pursuing their education elsewhere in the country or abroad. In our opinion third level students should on the contrary consider their family home address as their place of usual residence for the following reasons:

- For consistency with primary and secondary students. According to point 2 paragraph 140 the primary and secondary education students are considered as usual residents at their family home address regardless of whether they are pursuing their education elsewhere in the country or abroad. The same should apply to tertiary students.
- Tertiary students even when studying abroad are not abroad “for a continuous period of 12 months”, but most of them spend a large part (about 4 months) in their home country during vacations.
- Tertiary level students are still economically dependent on their families.

- For consistency purposes with the national accounts definition of population (ESA 95), which by convention includes students at their home address.
- The absence of tertiary students from their home country distorts the educational attainment of the population of the home country and in particular in the ages of 18-29. It also affects the compilation of various education indicators in the relevant age groups.

The problem is particularly relevant in the case of Cyprus, where the number of students abroad is not insignificant. In the academic year 2004/2005 out of a total of 34000 Cypriot tertiary students 19000 were abroad, that is 56% of Cypriot tertiary students or 2,5% of the total population.

Comment by the State Statistical Office of Estonia:

51. With reference to para. 140. 3: Doesn't the rule, that usual resident is a person who have lived or intends to live in his/here usual residence for at least 12 months, apply to third level students who study abroad for less than 12 months? If it is so, it should be clearly mentioned, otherwise countries would have different approach and some people might be double-counted or in some cases not counted at all.

Comment by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom):

52. Are the terms 'primary students', 'secondary students' and 'third level students' universally understood? There is a lack of clarity between these terms and the terms used in para 309 in Chapter 6.

Para 144-145 Temporarily present persons

Comment by INE (Spain):

53. In Spain, this concept was investigated for the last time in the 1991 Census. What we used to call 'transeúnte' (transient) is no longer useful, because it fails to help measuring the real burden of population of each municipality adequately, on one hand, and because of its bad integration with measuring population on a register basis, on the other. Instead of this, in 2001 census we tried another related concept: 'población vinculada' (linked population), defined as the exclusive sum of: resident population + persons that works or study in the municipality + persons that have a second residence in the municipality.

Comment by the Director of the UNECE Statistical Division:

54. At the end of paragraph 144, the following sentence should be added: "... are considered as temporarily present persons and not be counted in the total usually resident population."

Comment by Statistics Finland:

55. With reference to para. 145: Data on short-term migrants and their reason for migration should not be in census. It is another topic. Census is only counting usual residence.

Comment by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom):

56. We need to be sure that what we are saying here is consistent with what is being recommended in Chapter 7.

Para. 147-148 Temporarily absent persons

Comments by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom):

57. In para. 147: "This is regardless of the length of regular visits that..."

58. There may seem to be a conflict between what we are saying here and the recommendation that temporary absent persons should be enumerated where their families are.

Comment by Statistics Finland:

59. With reference to para. 148: Absent persons living abroad should be deleted from the census.

Para. 153 Total population – Illegal, irregular or undocumented migrants

Comment by Statistics Finland:

60. Illegal, irregular, and undocumented persons can not be counted in register based censuses and most probably not by questioners either.

Comment by INE (Spain):

61. Usually, population registers only include legal immigrants, Spanish Padron being one of the few exceptions to this almost universal rule. So, censuses that take the population counts directly from the PR, what practical and feasible measures can implement to follow the recommendation of this paragraph?

Para. 153 Total population – De jure population

Comment by Statistics Norway:

62. In paragraph 153, the de-jure population is considered equivalent to the usually resident population. However, this interpretation differs from that in countries with a population register, where the de-jure population refers to the population defined in accordance with the registration rules - this population may be the same as or different from the usually resident population as defined in Chapter 3. The interpretation of de-jure population in paragraph 153 is also different from that in Chapter 10; see for example paragraphs 442 and 458. The addition in parentheses in paragraph 153 "(which is sometimes called de-jure population)" can safely be omitted.

Para. 154 Total population – Asylum seekers

Comment by Statistics Finland:

63. With reference to para. 154: According to definitions asylum seekers are not counted to the population before they have been granted the permit to stay. Some of them have to wait for more than a year. According to this paragraph those should be counted to the population?

Para. 155 Total population

Comments by Statistics Finland:

64. Paragraph 155 should be deleted. These should be census recommendations.

Comment by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom):

65. In para. 155.4 the reference to groups 10 and 11 refer to items 2 and 3 in the same para. It might be less confusing if we number 1-4 here as 9-12 instead so that they are not confused with the items listed in para 152 [a similar comment was sent by Estonia]

Para. 157 Total population

Comment by INE (Spain):

66. Publishing two significantly different collections of population figures may lead the users to confusion. In our opinion, it's clearly preferable to make every effort to estimate the figures accurately **before the first, and only, count is released.**

Paragraphs 159- 160 Locality

Comment by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom):

67. The text here is the same as in the 2000 Recommendations but it is not clear whether we are always considering population or physical structures. The following text could be used: "159. For census purposes, a 'locality' is defined as a distinct population cluster, that is, the area defined by population living in neighbouring, or contiguous, buildings. 160. Such buildings may either:
2. though not part of such a built-up area ,comprise a group of buildings to which
3..... two requirements constitute a group of buildings, none of which....."

Para. 174-175 Location of place of work

Comment by INE (Spain):

68. In paragraph 174, detail of 'street address and locality' is mentioned. However, in paragraph 175, codification is recommended at 'smallest possible civil division' (in Spanish case, this is usually interpreted as municipality). So, the doubt is: would it be enough asking directly for the municipality of work? In 2001, we used this question, instead of asking for the exact location of work, for two reasons: 1) Asking for the exact address of work would have presented acceptance problems, because this is considered as more sensitive information than only the municipality of work (confirmed in the first test of 2001 census); 2) The exact address and locality would have been a fairly difficult answer to codify and edit.

Comments by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom):

69. The following text is proposed: ".....(that is, street address, locality and postal code)....."

70. In some countries home working or working from home is significant. We should not be recommending that only information on workplace outside the home should be collected.

71. Do we need to include this information here as well as in para. 255 in Chapter 5?

Para. 178/3.0 Mode of transport to work

Comment by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom):

72. Consider adding 'taxi' as 3.3 to distinguish from a passenger in a private car

Para. 181 Distance travelled to work and time taken

Comment by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom):

73. Is it worth considering including a note here about which address should be considered as the start point for journeys to work. It is not always clear what this should be, particularly in the case of people who have a second (week-day) residence from which they usually travel to work.

4. Demographic Characteristics

Para. 185 Sex

Comment by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom):

74. We should be consistent in the use of the word 'sex' rather than 'gender' throughout the report.

Para. 187 Age

Comment by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom):

75. The following revised text is proposed: "Many countries in the region have identified children, young adults and the elderly as particular population groups for which various types of census data will be required. The types of data on children and young adults that are likely to be of interest [delete to countries] include topics such as..... For the elderly, data on marital status, economic activity status, position in the family and household, health and type of living quarters are some of the topics, cross-classified by age and sex, that are likely appropriate for the dissemination of those data on children, young adults and the elderly....."

Para. 190-192 Legal marital status

Comment by Statistics Finland:

76. To the classification in 190 should be added 5. in a registered partnership, 6. widowed after registered partnership and 7. dissolved registered partnership. In countries, where it is possible to register same sex partnerships, it is experienced as discriminating, if these marital statuses don't have categories of their own.

Comment by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom):

77. The following revised text is proposed for para. 192: "Some countries that legally recognise people living in a registered partnership may wish to include these as a separate category". The main point is that they should be identified separately and not included with the 'married'.

Para. 195-198 De facto marital status

Comment by Statistics Finland:

78. Paragraphs 195-197 Should be deleted. De facto marital status comes out in family statistics that are made according to living arrangements. It is better not to mix these concepts here. If these are kept here, then the categories in 196 should also include: 6.in a registered partnership, 7. living in a consensual same sex partnership, 8. widowed after registered partnership and 9. dissolved registered partnership.

Comments by Statistics Norway:

79. The notion of consensual union is not defined in para 196. The definition is postponed to paragraph 459. Hence, reference should be made to paragraph 459 here.

80. The five categories proposed for de facto marital status are not mutually exclusive. Many persons who live in a consensual union (category 3) are never-married (category 1). Some of them are divorced or widowed (categories 4 and 5). Others are married (category 2), but live in a different household than the legal spouse. Sometimes both partners in a consensual union are married, but not married to each other. There are two alternative solutions to the problem. One is to add “not living in a consensual union” to categories 1, 2, 4, and 5. The alternative, and simpler solution is to include “whether or not living in a consensual union” as a non-core topic, and combine the information from that topic with that on legal marital status.

Comments by INE (Spain):

81. What about a widow living with a couple although not remarried? Either he goes to 3 or to 4, some information about one of these categories would be lost. In our opinion, marital status must use de jure concept, it is almost redundant having to clarify this. And information about living with a couple or not may be better obtained with a specific question, also useful, moreover, to help creating all the family types.

82. Another problem of this question is that some married people does not live with her/his husband/wife, so the number of persons living with a couple, with this formulation, would be unknown, even in the case that a widow not remarried but living in a consensual union goes to 3, which is not obvious and disturbs the estimation of the number of widow persons.

Para. 199 Total number of children born alive

Comment by Statistics Finland:

83. If the total number of children is collected to all women, it should be collected to all men as well. The explaining variables for the fertility of men are quite different from those for women.

Para. 201 Date(s) of legal marriage(s) of ever-married women

Comment by Statistics Finland:

84. The information of the date of the first marriage is not available in the Finnish data. This goes to the field of FFS study. If we ask about previous marriages should we at least ask what is the order of the current marriage?

Para. 202 Date(s) of the beginning of the consensual union(s)

Comment by Statistics Finland:

85. The dates of consensual union are probably very unreliable if asked. And here is asked only the first and the current, and still suggested, that the marriage history can be combined out of these.

The date for the current consensual union could be found from our database but for the standard statistical purposes it is not done.

Comments by Statistics Norway:

86. The notion of consensual union is not defined in para 202. The definition is postponed to paragraph 459. Hence, reference should be made to paragraph 459 here.

87. 5. Economic Characteristics

Para 209 Economic activity of persons

Comment by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom):

88. Insert following text at the end of para.: "Countries will, however, wish to balance the cost of collecting and processing information relating to the economic activity of elderly persons against the value and questionable reliability of the data collected, particularly among those aged 75 and over."

Para 226(3) Unemployed persons – Category "unemployed, never worked before"

Comment by Bob Pember (ILO):

89. Paragraph 2.194(c) of the 1998 Principles and Recommendations states "It would be useful to distinguish first-time job-seekers from other job-seekers in the classification of the unemployed." This is a useful and important statement that is not mentioned in the UNECE recommendations for 2000 and (I think) should have been in the UNECE draft for the 2010 round.

90. I would propose that at the end of para. 226(3), the following text be added: "It would be useful to distinguish first-time job-seekers from other job-seekers in the classification of the unemployed. Tabulations of the unemployed by occupation, industry, etc should exclude or separately identify first-time job-seekers." (see also related comment on para. 268)

Paragraphs 230-233 Time usually worked

Comment by ILO:

91. This topic could be non-core. Therefore these paragraphs should be relocated to come before Time-related underemployment (old para 269, new para 274) and would have new para numbers 270 to 273.

Comment by INE(Spain):

92. We think that for topics Time usually worked and Occupation is excessive to collect information about all the jobs (para. 231) when a person is performing more than one: it may have some interest, certainly, but is not cost-effective to include this question in the census form for all the people, when only a few person must or are going to respond it. A good thing would be to obtain this information from administrative sources. In Spain, we are trying to get it.

Comment by the State Institute of Statistics of Turkey:

93. This topic should not be core topic. According to the experiences of Turkey LFS, it is not easy to collect accurate data on hours worked; especially for irregular, seasonal and agricultural activities. The share of these activities in total employment is very high in Turkey. Therefore we suggest that "time usually worked" should be considered as non-core topic.

Para 234-238 Occupation

Comment by INE(Spain):

94. See comment above on topic Time usually worked (Para. 231 of the draft recommendations).

Comment by the Director of the UNECE Statistical Division:

95. Collecting data on occupation in a census is very expensive. Perhaps this should be considered as a non-core topic.

Para 239-242 Industry

Comment by INE (Spain):

96. The observation for this paragraph could be the same that the one for topic Location of place of work (Para. 174 of the draft recommendations). The name of the enterprise is a very private information, not very easy to obtain.

Comment by the Director of the UNECE Statistical Division:

97. Collecting data on industry (if information is not already available and coded from business registers) is difficult, cumbersome and costly. Perhaps this should be considered as a non-core topic.

Para 244-245 Status in employment

Comments by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom):

98. For category 5 in para. 244 there is perhaps a need to refer to para 286 which talks about the informal nature of producers' cooperatives if they are not formally established as legal entities?

99. Para 245 retained from the 2000 Recommendation should be re-drafted as follow: "It is also recommended that "owner-managers of incorporated enterprises" should be separately identified so that they may be classified either separately or among "employees" for particular descriptive and analytical purposes."

Para 268 Recommended classification by activity status (see also comment on para.226(3))

Comment by ILO:

100. In para 268 relating to the classification by activity status, the group of the unemployed who never worked before should be added as a sub-set of the unemployed, that is:

1. Economically active
 - 1.1 employed
 - 1.2 unemployed, of which
 - 1.2.1 unemployed, never worked before.

101. It is also proposed that the text of paragraph 268 relating to Recommended classification by activity status (current or usual) be moved after para 229 and re-numbered as paragraph 230.

Para 269 Time -related unemployment

Comment by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom) and by the Director of the UNECE Statistical Division:

102. This topic could be dropped

Para 275 Selection of “job” to be classified by descriptive variables

Comments by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom):

103. The concept of "occupation", "industry" and "status in employment" have already been introduced, but not "sector". This is not discussed until paragraph 280. I suggest we move paras 280-282 to before para 243 (as was the case in the 2000 recommendations).

104. "For "employed" persons it is therefore recommended that the main job held during the reference period is first established then the second most important job. worked most of the time among any other jobs held"

Comment by ILO:

105. The group of paragraphs 275-279, relating to the Selection of “job” to be classified by descriptive variables, should be inserted before “Occupation” (old para 234) and re-numbered as paragraphs 231-235. These were incorrectly removed from this location as a result of the re-arrangement of paragraphs to put all core topics together at the beginning of each chapter.

Para 280 Type of sector and Para 284 Informal employment

Comment by the Director of the UNECE Statistical Division:

106. These two topics should be considered as derived topics.

Para 290 Number of persons working in the local unit of the establishment

Comments by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom):

107. Add: "Some countries national requirements might demand a more detailed sub-classification of 4.0.". For example, in the UK 2001 Census question 'How many people work (worked) for your employer at the place where you work (worked)?' had breaks between:

- 9 and 10 - to use with the occupation code in mapping to the European variant of ISCO
- 24 and 25 - to use in the derivation of the National Statistics Socio-economic Classification

499 and 500 or more - to use in assigning the code for the occupation unit group 'Directors and chief executives of major organisations'.

108. The 9/10 break complies with the definition given on page 15 of 'ISCO 88 (COM) Definition of the version of the 1988 International Standard Classification of Occupations for use within the European Community'. The 10/11 break in the suggested classification in paragraph 290, therefore appears to be incorrect.

109. However, in the discussion across Europe on the updating of ISCO and the design of the European Socio-economic Classification (E-SEC), there is a suggestion that the 9/10 break is too low and a break around 50 may be better. There is also an opinion that the question should not be restricted to workplace but report on the number of employees in the whole organisation (previously called establishment). The developers of the National Statistics Socio-Economic Classification preferred whole organisation. Those with experience of question wording argued that the question works better if based on the workplace, so NS-SEC uses the question based on workplace.

Comment by ILO:

110. Para 290: Amend the suggested classification to be:

1-4 persons

5-9 persons

10-19 persons

20-49 persons

50 persons or more

Para 291 Main source of livelihood

Comment by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom):

111. "It is recommended that preference is given to a long reference period, such as the preceding twelve months, calendar year or financial year, in order to take account..."

Para. 298 Income

Comments by the State Institute of Statistics of Turkey:

112. Income received by each household member and from each source of livelihood in accordance with the classification proposed in paragraph-294 is covered in income topic (paragraph-298) in the document. After looking over the income definition mentioned in the paragraph-298, it is suggested that Category-5 are covered as "income" according to paragraph-294.

113. Category-5 ("Loans or reduction of savings and realization of capital") covers the situation in which a person's main source of livelihood is the proceeds from the sale of assets or from drawing on savings or from loans according to paragraph-295 in the document.

114. Actually, these types of sources are main source of livelihood and these are not included in the "household disposable income" in "Household Budget Survey" in Turkey. These types of

information have been taking place in the survey. But they haven't been used in the household disposable income. Therefore, we suggest excluding Category-5 given in paragraph-294 from the definition of income given in paragraph-298.

Para 300 Income

Comment by the Director of the UNECE Statistical Division:

115. A reference should be added to the Canberra Manual.

6. Educational Characteristics

Para 306 Educational attainment

Comment by the State Statistical Office of Estonia:

116. According to the previous recommendations information on educational attainment should have been collected for all persons above the maximum age for starting compulsory schooling (in current version it's minimum age, so the approach seems to be changed?) In Estonia the age for starting compulsory schooling provided by law is 7 years. There can be exceptions for some reasons but the exceptions can't be regarded as the minimum or maximum age of compulsory schooling.

117. Is it necessary to collect data on educational attainment for children who are in a very beginning of their schooling, it is clear they have no level completed. The data on educational attainment should be collected in the same principle as the data on literacy — for all persons aged 10 years and over. If necessary countries can reduce the age limit but for international comparison educational attainment of persons aged 10 years and older should be enough.

Para 309

Comment by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom):

118. This para refers to "post-secondary" level where as para 140.3 refers to "third level" students. If these are one and the same should we be consistent in their terminology?

Para 321 School attendance

Comment by the State Statistical Office of Estonia:

119. It is not clear if only the information on formal education should be collected or is there a suggestion to collect information on non-formal education too.

Comment by the Director of the UNECE Statistical Division:

120. This topic could be considered as a core topic.

7. International and Internal Migration Characteristics

Para 321 Reason for migration

Comment by the Director of the UNECE Statistical Division:

121. In the classification, category 5. "free establishment" could be renamed "other voluntary migration".

Para 346 Country/place of birth

Comment by Statistics Finland:

122. Country of birth can not be classified according to the boundaries of the states at the time of census in register based censuses. If a person's country of birth in the register is for instance Soviet Union, it is impossible to know what the country would be according the time of census.

Comment by the State Institute of Statistics of Turkey:

123. In the recommendations for 2000 censuses, place of birth is defined as the place of residence of the mother at the time of birth in paragraph 76 in page 20. On the contrary, in the 2010 recommendations, place of birth is defined as the geographical unit in which the birth took place. Two definitions are completely different from each other. However, as the 2000 recommendations mentioned information on place of birth is used as an indicator for estimates of internal and international migration. In Turkey, this information has been widely used to analyze migration situation in the country by the users. Therefore, we strongly suggest using same definition given in the 2000 recommendations.

Para 351 Place of usual residence one year prior to the census

Comment by Statistics Finland:

124. Country of usual residence one year prior to the census, if it is outside of the country, is impossible for the countries with register based censuses. The only information that is available is from what country the person has immigrated.

Comment by INE (Spain):

125. Although this is a core topic, we did not ask it directly in 2001 census questionnaire. We derived it from the others topics related to migration.

Para 375 Population with refugee background

Comment by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom):

126. "The broad definition of the population of refugees also includes"

127. In the definition of group B we have a reference to group B itself. This is a bit circular and I am not sure I understand it. Also reference to "group a" should be "group A"

8. Ethno-cultural Characteristics

Para 405 Religion

Comment by the State Statistical Office of Estonia:

128. The meaning of the categories in the points 2 and 3 should be explained (what exactly is a difference between “religious belief” and “identification with certain religion”?)

Para 411 Religion

Comment by the Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom):

129. In the classification, the category “Anglican” appears twice, once in 1.3 (under 'Protestant') and once in 1.4 in its own category. Anglican is Protestant; therefore it should be under 1.3, and category 1.4 “Anglican” should be deleted [a similar comment was sent by Cyprus and Estonia]

Comment by the Statistical Service of Cyprus:

130. Check whether Jehova’s witnesses can be classified as Christians.

9. Disability

Comment by the State Statistical Office of Estonia:

131. We'd like to make a suggestion that recommendations should propose an eligible formulation for questions on disability/health status. As questions on health base on people's assessment the harmonized formulation of the questions would be the best way to guarantee the international comparability of the data.

Para. 440

Comment by INE (Spain):

132. Information about health is especially protected in some confidentiality laws and this can prevent this variable to be compulsory, as the rest. On the contrary, once obtained, we think it can be used for any declared statistical aim of the census, serving as directory for sample surveys in particular. Having to warn it explicitly in the questionnaires might be a serious practical handicap.

10. Household and Family Characteristics

Para 446 The household concept

Comments by INE (Spain):

133. We do not understand this paragraph: countries using housekeeping concept can also give figures for the household-dwelling concept, not being true in the other direction.

Para 456 Definition of family nucleus

Comments by Statistics Finland:

134. The text should be: “A family nucleus is defined in the narrow sense as two or more persons ~~within a private household~~ who are related as husband and wife, as cohabiting partners, **as married/registered or cohabiting same sex couple** or as parent and child.”

135. Because ‘husband and wife, as cohabiting partners’ do not as we understand include same sex registered couples. One can not call them husband and wife and if they have registered their relation they cannot be called cohabiting partners. In Finland the distinction is clear, it is not a wedding, it is called registration. May be in some countries they can be married, but still you can not call them husband and wife. And as far as we understand in Netherlands for instance they have both registered same sex couples and cohabiting same sex couples. And in questionnaire surveys in countries that allow same sex marrying or registration can also cohabiting of same sex be questioned. And why should families in institutional households be excluded in the definition. It is another thing if there is data available about them. So the reference to the dwelling should be left out. In 462 it is even stated that they can be included in the statistics.

Para 458 Definition of children

Comment by Statistics Finland:

136. Does it cause confusion, if there are parents and children and on top of that for instance one grandchild, whose parents don’t live in the household? How would this family be classified? (460) This is not a three-generation family either?

Para 459 Definition of couple

Comment by Statistics Norway:

137. Replace “registered couple” by “registered partners” (see paragraph 192).

Para 461 Definition of reconstituted family

Comment by Statistics Finland:

138. This paragraph doesn't define same sex couples with children. Can this be understood, that in countries where it is allowed for the other spouse to adopt the child of her spouse they are not a reconstituted family, otherwise yes. It doesn't sound correct. The family is not actually reconstituted, if the couple has been already together when the child is born.

Para 463

Comment by Statistics Norway:

139. "Reference member of the household" is not defined. Refer to paragraph 473.

Para 465-479 Relationships between household members – Reference person

Comment by State Institute of Statistics of Turkey:

140. The traditional "household head" concept will be more useful than the concept of "reference person" to provide reliable information in Turkey. Therefore, we suggest to use "household head" concept for collecting data on the relationship between household members.

Para 466 Relationships between household members – Household relationship matrix

Comment by INE (Spain):

141. The Household relationship matrix method has two serious disadvantages:

1) In easy composition households, it is very redundant, being the relationship with the reference person enough.

2) In more intricate compositions, where the relationship with the reference person is not enough, it may be fairly difficult to answer that matrix without errors.

For these reasons, if the relationship with the reference person is not considered enough, we think the best complement is asking directly for the father, mother and couple of every person of the household: they are easier to answer and needs less space in the questionnaires, what may be also very important.

Comment by Statistics Norway:

142. Refer to paragraph 473 for a definition of "reference person".

Para 469 Relationships between household members – Household relationship matrix

Comment by Statistics Finland:

143. It is not logical here to include to 2.2 both registered and cohabiting same sex couples. Instead (1.0) should be divided to two subsection 1.1 Husband and wife and 1.2 Same sex registered/married couple. The same in 475, 477 as well.

Comment by State Institute of Statistics of Turkey:

144. Recommended classification of persons living in a private household by relationship to other household members contains same-sex cohabiting partner. This concept is not common and not approved in our country. It is not possible to collect accurate data for this item. Therefore, it should not be a part of the classification. We suggest that it should be written in the recommendations as “if a country prefers to collect data for same-sex cohabiting partners, it can be included in the classification”.

Para 481 Household status

Comment by Statistics Finland:

145. Same sex couples have again been left out. It should be:

1.1.1 Husband/**the older partner in a same sex marriage/registration**

1.1.2 Wife/**the younger partner in a same sex marriage/registration**

And the same for 1.1.3 and 1.1.4.

1.1.3 ..**the older partner in a same sex consensual union**

1.1.4 ..**the younger partner in a same sex consensual union**

Comment by Statistics Norway:

146. Categories (1.2.2.) “Living with others” and (1.2.4.) “Living with non-relatives” overlap. Delete (1.2.2.) and renumber.

Para 486 Family status

Comment by Statistics Finland:

147. The same classification as in 481. Children should also be classified if they are children of the younger or older spouse of male or female couple.

Para 494 Type of family nucleus

Comments by Statistics Finland:

148. Here again the same sex couples have been left out. It is very important that the basic classifications are made accurate. The subject matter is not dealt with the paragraph 502. What do countries with this kind of families do? 504 says that these families should be distinguished from different sex couples. Why the classification is not made ready to do that? The classification should not be a problem for the countries without these kinds of families; they only have empty cells.

149. There should be categories for registered/married same sex couples and cohabiting same sex couples with or without children. And they should be split to female couples and male couples as well. Even though these groups are marginal, they are families according to the law in many countries. That is why it is outrageous if they are left out of basic family classifications. The census recommendations is a good means to have these statistics harmonized. For instance shall we take in

use the concept of older and younger spouse because there is no other evident classification of spouses so that it wouldn't be random who is chosen as the 'reference person' of that kind of family.

Para 498-501 Identifying reconstituted families

Comment by Statistics Norway:

150. This section is called "Identifying reconstituted families (derived non-core topic)". A better title, more in line with other sections, would be "Reconstituted families (derived non-core topic)".

Comment by the State Statistical Office of Estonia and Statistics Norway:

151. In para. 498 there is a reference to para 441, but it should be to para 461.

Comment by INE (Spain):

152. With reference to para. 498.4 "Birth dates": If all natural children ever-born to each adult are known, is this not enough to identify reconstituted families?

Paragraphs 507, 508, 516

Comment by Statistics Norway:

153. Replace "resident members" by "usually resident members".

Para 510 Type of private household

Comment by Statistics Finland:

154. There should again be all the same categories for the same sex couples and even split by sex.

Para 515 Generational composition of private household

Comment by INE (Spain):

155. Generation may be defined and implemented in several alternative ways. More details about it might be advisable.

Para 525 Rent

Comment by the Director of the UNECE Statistical Division:

156. This topic should be considered in the chapter on housing.

11. Agriculture

Para 535.c Own-account agriculture production

Comment by the Director of the UNECE Statistical Division:

157. The text should be modified: “Some countries... as a frame for a subsequent agricultural census or other surveys”.

158. It should be mentioned that the agricultural production in places different from the place of usual residence should be included.

12. HOUSING TOPICS: Living quarters, Dwellings and Housing Arrangements

General comment by the State Statistical Office of Estonia:

159. In general: Chapter 12 is very difficult to understand because too many terms are used for one thing. For example:

- Conventional main residence dwelling – main residence dwelling – conventional main dwelling (= occupied conventional dwelling) – why one term can't be used for that? Right now there is a risk that the content of recommendation won't get enough attention because the orientating in terms is too complicated and the text is difficult to follow.

- Non-conventional dwelling – other housing unit

It is very confusing to use so many concepts (housing unit, living quarter, other housing unit, other living quarter), which are sometimes partly overlapping.

160. Also it's not clear for which dwellings the information on different characteristics of housing units is necessary to report (it's understandable that the information has to be provided for occupied conventional dwellings (conventional main residences or conventional main dwellings) but in some cases also for other living quarters (or should it be housing units?). Couldn't there be a certain principle always? For example the information should certainly be collected for occupied conventional dwellings and it is optional for the rest of housing units. Or is it necessary to collect information for all living quarters (incl. collective living quarters)?

Para. 547.1 Other housing units

Comment by Statistics Austria:

161. The term "Gipsy camps" should be replaced by Camps of Nomads, Sinti, Roma or similar term.

Parag. 550 Collective living quarters

Comment by Statistics Norway:

162. Paragraph 448 defines "institution" as a legal body, and uses the term "institutional living quarters", but does not define the latter. Paragraph 550 point 2 defines "institution" as a certain type of living quarters. The two paragraphs have to be made consistent.

Para. 565 Occupancy status of conventional main dwellings

Comment by Statistics Austria:

163. Do we need this repetition of 541 in 565? The last sentence of the paragraph is in contradiction with 546 and – in our opinion - wrong.

Para. 570-571 Type of ownership of conventional main dwellings

Comments by INE (Spain):

164. We don't understand very well this core topic. Checking the 2001 tabulation program, we have seen that tables 24 and 26 ask, respectively, for tenure status and type of ownership, and the difference between them is that the first one is referred to private households and the second one is referred to occupied conventional dwellings. The concrete doubt is: if we use the definition of household as housing unit (dwelling), are "tenure status" and "type of ownership" equivalent topics?

165. It would be very useful if you could clarify the categories for this topic given in paragraph 571.

Para. 577 Overcrowding

Comment by INE (Spain):

166. Overcrowding has more to do with useful floor space than with the number of rooms, due to the open designs, with very few, but ample, independent spaces. For instance, there are dwellings of 150 or more meters and only 3 rooms, and dwellings of 60 me-ters and 8 or more rooms. Therefore, for us, the core topic should be the useful floor space and the non-core, the number of rooms..

Para. 588 Infrastructure characteristics of housing units

Comment by the State Statistical Office of Estonia:

167. In this point it is recommended: "information on the characteristics of all housing units should be collected where possible". But in case of various topics (kitchen, water supply system, toilet facilities, bathing facilities etc.) it is often recommended that information should be optionally collected for all living quarters too.

Para 589 Kitchen

Comment by INE (Spain):

168. In Spain this is not a cost-effective question and in 2001 we did not already include it. Moreover, it tends to be misunderstood as the other sense ok kitchen, that is, 'cooking facilities'. To continue labelling it as core topic is fairly arguable.

Para 592 Kitchen

Comment by the State Statistical Office of Estonia:

169. This classification is considered to be a core topic for conventional Main Residence dwellings (there was a promise in point 542 to call it "conventional main dwellings) but optional for other living quarters and secondary, seasonal or other vacant dwellings.

Para. 593-594 Water supply system

Comments by the State Statistical Office of Estonia:

170. In para 593 the text says: “All countries should report separately on water supply systems for conventional main dwellings and where appropriate for all living quarters...”. Is it sure that this characteristic is needed for collective living quarters too? Maybe there should be “for all housing units”.

171. In para 594 the text says: “The following classification of living quarters by type of water supply system is recommended:

(1.0) Piped water in the living quarters

(1.1.) From a community scheme

(1.2.) From a private source

(2.0) Piped water outside the conventional main dwellings/living quarters

(2.1.) Piped water available within the building but outside the housing unit...”

Should there be “Living quarters” or “housing units”?

Comment by INE (Spain):

172. To collect this topic for all the living quarters is, in practice, equivalent to collect this topic only once for the building. If a building counts on water supply system, normally count on it all the dwellings content inside the building. Traditionally, in Spain we ask this topic in the building questionnaire.

Para 597 Toilet facilities

Comment by INE (Spain):

173. In Spain we collect topics Toilet facilities and Bathing facilities only for conventional main dwellings. Generally, is not easy to collect information about toilet and bathing facilities for non-conventional dwellings because we have problem to contact the owners.

Para 600 Bathing facilities

Comment by the State Statistical Office of Estonia:

174. “All countries should report separately on bathing facilities for conventional main dwellings but information on the availability of bathing facilities in other living quarters should also be reported.

(1.0) Fixed bath or shower in the housing unit”

Comment by INE (Spain):

175. In Spain we collect topics Toilet facilities and Bathing facilities only for conventional main dwellings. Generally, is not easy to collect information about toilet and bathing facilities for non-conventional dwellings because we have problem to contact the owners.

Para 608 Hot water

Comment by the State Statistical Office of Estonia:

176. The text says: “Information should be given separately on the availability of hot water to conventional main dwellings and, depending on the availability of information, to living quarters”. Perhaps it would be correct to say: “other living quarters”, cause conventional main dwellings are also on category of living quarters.

Para 610. Type of sewage disposal system

Comment by the State Statistical Office of Estonia:

177. It is preferable that all countries collect information on the type of sewage disposal system in conventional main dwellings and report it separately. It is suggested that countries which use the building as a unit of enumeration or of data collection should collect information on the type of sewage disposal system to which the building containing the living quarters is connected, and to cross-classify living quarters by type of toilet facilities at the one-digit level and type of sewage disposal system.

Para. 614-616 Main type of energy used for heating

Comment by the State Statistical Office of Estonia:

178. In para 614 the text says: “Type of heating is limited to the types of heating facilities that are available in living quarters. Some countries may also wish to collect information on the main type of energy used for heating purposes. If this information is available it should be reported separately for conventional main dwellings.” In para. 615: “The following classification of conventional main dwellings/living quarters by main type of energy used for heating purposes is suggested: ...” In para 616: “Countries should indicate in the census reports how the main type of energy was selected in a housing unit where two types of energy were equally used for heating purposes.”

Para. 631 Type of building

Comment by INE (Spain):

179. We would like to obtain some more explanation about category 1.0 Residential buildings and its sub-categories.

Annex:
Proposal for a new section to be included in
Appendix II: Alternative Approaches to Census-taking
(submitted by INE, Spain)

I. Description of the census type consisting in a combination of registers and a complete enumeration

Description

1. The essence of this census type is to make use of the administrative registers relevant to a census (to reduce costs and to lessen the response burden), but complemented with an exhaustive statistical operation, with a twofold aim: to improve the accuracy of population counts, on one hand, and to obtain the census variables not available from the combination of registers, on the other hand.
2. There are two major differences from the most similar census type (combination of administrative registers with sample surveys):
 - Variables not available from administrative registers are not obtained by sample surveys but through an exhaustive field operation, as in a classical census.
 - The population count based on the population register is not immediately accepted as the best possible, but checked and corrected against reality through the complete enumeration. The census is thus an exhaustive evaluation of the coverage of the population register, and allow accurately to adjust population counts and reduce the main sources of under-coverage (typical of the classical censuses) and over-coverage (typical of some population registers).

A. Necessary conditions

3. The main technical and legal conditions for this census type to be suitable are:
 - **Availability of a Population Register (PR).** The Register need not be completely reliable for demographic purposes, but it must be reliable enough as an initial solution for how many people, whom and where will be counted in census figures.
 - **It is also advisable to have another administrative registers usable for census purposes.** Examples: Cadastre, tax files, Social Security affiliates, public registers of unemployed, educational qualification records, and so on.
 - If the two preceding conditions are met, it would be inefficient not to use that system of registers for the census. A further condition for this census type to be regarded, in certain circumstances, as the most suitable is that a census based exclusively on administrative registers is unfeasible for at least one of the following reasons:
 - i. The PR requires regular and exhaustive checks against reality (at least once every ten years) for its figures to be used accurately for statistical and demographic purposes.

- ii. The combination of administrative registers fails to cover all the essential needs of census information, and the missing variables are too significant in terms of quantity and/or quality for them to be covered adequately by sampling operations.
4. This type of census, as regards its relationship with the PR, has two variants, depending on whether it is simply the case that the census is supported by the PR, or whether the benefits are mutual, such that the PR uses the census operation to update and improve its information. If the second variant is chosen, two additional conditions are required:
 - The specific legislation governing the PR must expressly provide such use of the census operation to update the PR – while preserving the statistical confidentiality in the strictly census-related information.
 - Technical measures must be applied to ensure that the PR information to be checked, which will be used for both purposes (administrative and statistical), is treated in a proper and different way, all over the whole operation, from the rest of census information, which may only be used for statistical purposes. For example, in the questionnaires design, this may be achieved by isolating the PR variables in specific sheets; in the processing phases, files containing personal identifications should **not** contain statistical information, in the other way around.

B. Advantages and disadvantages

5. Population counts are more precise than in a classical census (thanks to the previous information contained in the PR, that plays the role of default solution and avoids many cases of under-coverage) and more precise, also, than in exclusively register-based census (thanks to the checking against reality that complete enumeration supplies, which prevents cumulative errors of the PR to grow indefinitely).
6. Information not available in the combination of registers is obtained in an exhaustive, classical, way, permitting maximum geographical and conceptual detail.
7. The longitudinal perspective that the use of registers allows is also present in this censuses, for example, using the PR as linchpin.
8. In few words, this census type tries to get together the best of both worlds, classical censuses and register-based censuses.
9. Disadvantages also comes from that intermediate-point condition.
10. For example, they are more expensive than exclusively register-based censuses, because of the exhaustive collection operation. However, it should be cheaper than classical censuses: the previous knowledge of the location where every person is registered permits the use of more efficient collection methods.

11. Response burden, other factors equal, is also somewhere between the minimum achieved in censuses without specific collection operation and the maximum of censuses with no previous information support.

C. Implications for the various phases of census-taking

12. Pre-filling questionnaires with PR information is a complex technical task (in particular, requires especial printing devices), especially when associated with the large census volume and with the constraints imposed by optical reading technology; for example the necessity of finding the information in a very exact location of the questionnaire to be effective, or the convenience of using *blind colours* for the fixed, non-informative, parts of the questionnaires.
13. Previous censuses information and related administrative data facilitates a much more informed correction and imputation of incoherence and missing values.
14. Dissemination also gets benefits from the previous censuses information, because of the longitudinal perspective it allows.

D. Implications for content

15. Combination of registers and exhaustive collection operation permits maximum flexibility in the content, while reducing the response burden in comparison with a classical census with the same information.
16. Compared with combining registers and sample surveys, the main advantage is the complete geographical and conceptual detail of **all** the variables, whether available in the registers or not.

* * * * *