



## Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General  
22 July 2013

Original: English

---

### Economic Commission for Europe

Conference of European Statisticians

Group of Experts on Population and Housing Censuses

Fifteenth Meeting

Geneva, 30 September – 3 October 2013

Item 7 of the provisional agenda

**Economic and educational characteristics**

### **Economic characteristics: Key results of the UNECE Survey on National Census Practices, and first proposals about the CES Recommendations for the 2020 census round**

### **Note by the UNECE Task Force on economic and educational characteristics**

#### *Summary*

In early 2013, UNECE conducted an online survey among its member countries on national practices in the 2010 round of population and housing censuses. This document presents an overview of the main results of the survey on economic characteristics (part I), some first proposals by the UNECE Task Force on economic and educational characteristics about the preparation of new CES Recommendations for the 2020 Round of Censuses on economic characteristics (part II) and comment from the International Labour Organization (ILO) on these proposals (part III).

## **I. Key results of the UNECE Survey on economic characteristics**

### **A. Survey question: Did you include a question or otherwise collect information in your census on current or usual economic activity status?**

1. All censuses in the UNECE region in the 2010 census round collected data on usual economic activity. Of the 33 countries, which collected information on current or usual economic activity status from a full enumeration, 31 were countries with a traditional census. Two countries with the combined method had a full enumeration. The countries having combined census usually collected information on sample data: (five out of eight countries). But also two countries (Canada and the United States) with the traditional census collected the information mainly from sample data using a census long form.

2. Germany used a combination of employment registers and sample data. In Poland additional information was collected from administrative records concerning employment insurance and registered unemployment. In Romania the information about usual economic activity status was derived from administrative sources for those records totally imputed.

### **B. Survey question: Was there a minimum or maximum age limit for collection of information on activity status for this census?**

#### **1. Minimum age**

3. The information on minimum age limit is available from 51 countries and the high majority of them (43) are harmonized with the CES Recommendations 2010 (paragraph 232) setting the limit to 15 years. There are three exceptions: the age limit in Spain and the United Kingdom was little higher (16 years), the only country using lower age limit than 15 was Kyrgyzstan (12 years).

4. Five countries (three of them are register-based — Austria, Finland and Iceland; two with traditional census — Greece and Slovakia) reported no minimum age limit in data collection.

#### **2. Maximum age**

5. The answers to the maximum age limit are more varied. The CES Recommendations 2010 (paragraph 232) stated: “Use of a maximum age limit for measurement of the economically active population is not recommended, as many people continue to be engaged in economic activities beyond their normal retirement age and because the numbers involved are likely to increase as a result of factors associated with the ‘ageing’ of the population. Countries may, however, wish to balance the cost of collecting and processing information relating to the economic activity of elderly persons (those aged 75 years or more) and the additional response burden imposed on them against the significance and reliability of the information provided”.

6. In general there was no limit at the stage of data collection: 36 countries reported “no limit”, additionally, 7 did not reply to that question, and it could be assumed that there was no limit also. Only four countries (Armenia — 75 years, the Netherlands — 75 years, the Russian Federation — 72 years and Sweden — 74 years) reported an explicit maximum age limit. But from the questionnaire it was not exactly clear if the maximum age limit referred to the “economically active” population only or to determine activity status in general. The Netherlands stated that above 75 years current activity status is assumed to be

in certain categories and this probably excluded “economically active” population. Few countries explained their maximum age limit and the most common solution is a threshold for unemployed which is 74 in Poland and Romania and 64 in Slovenia. Slovenia was the only country that reported different age limits for various type of economic activity (employed 15-74, students 15-49, retired 40+). The comment from Poland is relevant for later discussion on new set of recommendations: no age limit during data collection but maximum age limit (74 years) was introduced before data publication. In Slovenia the age limits for individual activity status were set already in the statistical process due to register-based approach combining several sources.

**C. Survey question: Were there any population groups on which the information on economic activity was not collected (apart from possible age limits)?**

7. Only ten countries (20 per cent) reported that there were some other groups on which the information on economic activity was not collected, for reasons other than possible age limits.

8. There was a large variety of the population groups on which information was not collected. Three countries mentioned the population living in collective households such as prisons and nursing homes (Germany, the Russian Federation and Switzerland). There were two countries that mentioned temporary resident people (Tajikistan and Ukraine).

9. Foreign nationals working in the offices of foreign states or in the offices of international organizations, foreign citizens who arrived in Kyrgyzstan on mission from foreign states or international organizations (Kyrgyzstan).

10. Also the homeless (the Russian Federation), contributing family workers (Sweden) and persons working abroad (Norway) were noted at least once. Lithuania mentioned the following groups: “economically inactive pupil, student, pensioner, person unemployed due to disability, homemaker, persons not having a job one week before the census and persons who never worked before”.

**D. Survey question: Which concept(s) of economically active population and which reference period(s) were used?**

11. The clear majority of responding countries, 65 per cent, used the concept of currently active population (CES Recommendations para. 233, 237), with a reference period of one week. This was the most popular concept and reference period in the traditional, combined as well as in the register-based census. Five countries used the currently active population concept, with reference period of one day (Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands and Slovakia). Three countries had another population concept (Ireland, Malta and Tajikistan). Four countries (Iceland, Kyrgyzstan, Sweden, and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia) used currently active population concept, with some other reference period.

12. The usually active population concept (CES Recommendations para. 233, 251), and reference period of one year were used in six countries, of which three were traditional census countries (Kyrgyzstan, Ukraine and the United States), two combined (Israel and Switzerland) and one register-based (Sweden). Only two countries (Kyrgyzstan and Sweden) used both concepts currently and usually active population in their census.

**E. Survey question: Were the following groups considered currently economically active in your census?****1. Contributing family members**

13. Contributing (unpaid) family workers were considered economically active in 43 (84 per cent) of countries. Only in seven countries they were not considered economically active of which three were register-based countries. This clearly indicates that in register-based census it is difficult to collect data of unpaid work as well as other unofficial activities.

**2. Unemployed persons who were never previously employed**

14. Unemployed persons who never previously worked were considered economically active in 44 countries and not active only in 6 countries. In this question there were not any significant differences between census methods. Seventy-five per cent of countries with combined census, 89 per cent register-based and 91 per cent of traditional census countries considered this group economically active.

**3. Armed forces**

15. Armed forces were considered economically active in 46 of those 48 countries that answered this question. Only Israel and the Russian Federation did not count them as economically active in the 2010 census. In the Russian Federation persons in compulsory military service living in collective households were not interviewed in the census. Persons in professional military service were enumerated at their own households and were considered as economically active.

**4. Part-time workers even though they may spend most time at non-gainful activities**

16. The group part-time workers even though they may spend most time at non-gainful activities were considered economically active almost in all of countries. Forty-eight out of 50 considered this group economically active. Only exceptions were Ireland and Croatia. In Ireland part-time workers were classified as economically inactive only if they were reported to be students or another inactive category at the time of the census, otherwise they were classified as economically active.

**5. Domestic servants**

17. Domestic servants were considered economically active in all countries except Canada, the Czech Republic and Lithuania.

**F. Survey question: Did you fully apply the recommended classification of population by activity status?**

18. In the 2010 CES Recommendations (para. 261) the recommended classification of economic activity status to be used in statistical outputs was:

- (1.0) Economically active
  - (1.1) Employed
  - (1.1) Unemployed, of which
    - (1.2.1) Never worked before

- (2.0) Not economically active
  - (2.1) Students
  - (2.2) Pension or capital income recipients
  - (2.3) Homemakers
  - (2.4) Others

19. The European Union (EU) regulations require the EU member states to report on the same mandatory activity categories in outputs to be made available to Eurostat.

20. Only 15 of the 48 countries that responded to the question (31 per cent) reported that they were not able to fully apply these activity categories. This proportion was fractionally less (30 per cent) among the EU member states where, despite the requirement of the EU regulation, 8 out of the 27 countries were not able to do so. Not surprisingly these included all but one of the countries that undertook their censuses using only information taken from administrative registers. Only Belgium of the EU register-based countries reported that they fully adopted the recommended classification. This reflects the general difficulties of using administrative records that contain data collected for non-statistical purposes. (Interestingly, Iceland was also a register-based country that was, nevertheless, able to adopt the full classification.)

21. Among the EU member states, Greece (traditional census) and Spain (combined approach) also reported difficulties in adopting the recommendation classification, along with seven other non-EU countries. Israel and Liechtenstein did not respond.

22. Several of the 15 countries that did not fully comply were, however, able to identify most of the recommended output categories, although some deficiencies were necessarily imposed by the limitations of data available from registers. For example Austria and Finland reported that they had no access to information on recipients of capital income, so that such people are included with "Homemakers and others" (2.4) rather than with "Pensioners" (2.2); Denmark, Spain and the United States were unable to identify "Homemakers" at all from its registers, and these would therefore be included with "Others" (2.4) (but this is sufficient to comply with the EU regulations). Albania, Finland, the Netherlands and the United States do not distinguish the unemployed who have never worked (1.2.1). Greece does not classify people doing compulsory military service (draft) as economically active. Norway does not distinguish economically inactive students (2.3) and these are therefore included with "Others" (2.4). Ukraine reported that it does not collect information on the unemployed at all.

#### **G. Survey question: To identify employed person did you fully apply the recommended definition?**

23. Only 9 of the 51 countries that responded to the question (18 per cent) reported that they were not able to fully apply recommended definition to identify employed persons (CES Recommendations para. 239). Of those nine countries, six carried out a register-based census. The other three were France (traditional/rolling census), Canada and the United States (traditional census with a short and a long form).

24. The most common exception was that the one-hour's employment criterion (CES Recommendations para. 240) was not used (in Finland, Iceland, the Netherlands, Norway and Slovenia). France used the self-definition as "employed" in response to the question "What is your main situation?" or response "yes" to the question "Are you currently employed?". Canada used the following definition of the employed: "Persons aged 15 years and over, who, during the week of Sunday, 1 May to Saturday, 7 May 2011 (a) did any

work at all at a job or business, that is, paid work in the context of an employer-employee relationship, or self-employment (it also includes persons who did unpaid family work, which is defined as unpaid work contributing directly to the operation of a farm, business or professional practice owned and operated by a related member of the same household) or (b) had a job but were not at work due to factors such as their own illness or disability, personal or family responsibilities, vacation or a labour dispute (this category excludes persons not at work because they were on layoff or between casual jobs, and those who did not then have a job, even if they had a job to start at a future date)". The United States used a four-week reference period.

**H. Survey question: To identify unemployed person did you fully apply the recommended definition, and in particular the criteria “without work” + “available for work” + “seeking work”?**

25. Among the 51 countries from which information was received, 44 countries (86.3 per cent) reported that they fully apply the recommended definition to identify unemployed person (CES Recommendations para. 247). and in particular the criteria “without work” + “available for work” + “seeking work”.

26. Only seven countries reported that they deviated from the recommended definition (Finland, France, Ireland, Liechtenstein, the Netherlands, Norway and Ukraine). Among those seven countries, Ukraine reported that the question on unemployment does not exist in their census.

27. In cases of non-compliance, there are smaller or larger deviations from recommended definition.

28. The Netherlands indicated that criteria “available for work” and “seeking work” were not taken into account since they calculated unemployment in the census on registers.

29. In Finland the unemployed labour force comprises persons aged 15-74 who are unemployed on the last working day of the year and are not undergoing military or non-military service.

30. For Norway deviation from the recommendation concerns “seeking work” — only if registered as job seeker by labour market authorities.

31. Liechtenstein reported that their census questionnaire asked if the person is *seeking work* with explanation a person seeking work and at the same time in gainful employment would be considered to be employed.

32. Ireland stated that persons were considered unemployed if they indicated a present principal status of “Looking for first regular job” or “Unemployed”.

33. France responded that they provided self-definition of “Unemployed” to the question “What is your main situation?”.

**I. Survey question: Status in employment: what was the main data source, did you fully comply with the CES definition, did you use the International Classification by Status in Employment (ICSE)-93 classification recommended by the CES, and can you provide data in ICSE-93?**

34. The topic “status in employment” was included in 48 countries out of the 51 that responded to the question. Only Canada and the United States did not include this topic in

their census. Twenty-seven countries collected these data using full enumeration, in nine countries the main data source used was sample data and in further nine countries, registers or administrative records.

35. Thirty-three countries reported that their definition of status in employment fully complied with the CES Recommendations (CES Recommendations para. 279). Thirteen countries used a definition that did not fully comply.

36. The classification used for status of employment was ICSE-93 (CES Recommendations para. 280) in 27 countries (62 per cent), 17 used some other classification than ICSE-93 for this topic. The most common difference was in the item members of producers' co-operatives and contributing family workers. It was not possible to collect information on these categories in Croatia, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom. Some countries make only a distinction between employers and employees (Finland, the Netherlands).

37. Thirty countries out of 39 provided the data in ICSE-93. Countries that were not able to provide data in ICSE-93 were Azerbaijan, Belarus, Estonia, Finland, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Norway, Sweden and the United Kingdom.

**J. Survey question: Occupation: what was the main data source, did you fully comply with the CES definition, what classification you used, can you provide data in the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO)-08 or ISCO-88?**

38. The topic occupation was included in the census in 48 countries. Only the Russian Federation and Ukraine did not have this topic in the census. Twenty-eight countries had these data from full enumeration, 14 from sample data and 6 from registers and administrative records. In the countries with combined method the sample data was most popular collection method (six out of eight countries). But also 33 per cent of countries with register-based census used sample data for this topic.

39. Only 2 of the 48 countries that responded to the question (Canada and Finland) reported that the definition used did not comply fully with the CES Recommendations (para. 270).

40. The classification used for occupation was ISCO-08 (CES Recommendations para. 271) in 24 countries; ISCO-88 was used in 13 countries. Ten countries used other usually national classifications which were based or at least compatible with ISCO-08 or ISCO-88. Only two countries reported they are not able to provide data neither in ISCO-08 nor in ISCO-88 (Armenia, the United States). Ten countries are able to provide data only in ISCO-88, but not in ISCO-08.

**K. Survey question: Industry: what was the main data source, did you fully comply with the CES definition, what classification you used, can you provide data in the International Standard Industrial Classification of All Economic Activities (ISIC)-Rev.4 or ISIC-Rev.3.1.**

41. Out of 47 countries that responded to the questions on industry only 2 (the Russian Federation and Ukraine) did not have the topic industry included in the census. The main data source used was full enumeration (26 countries), but also sample data were used in 11 countries. Sample data were most commonly used in countries with the combined method: Six out of eight countries with the combined method used sample data. From the countries

with a traditional census only four (Azerbaijan, Canada, Italy and the United States) used sample data. Also France used sample data in the rolling census. All register countries had industry included in their census (and used of course register and other administrative sources).

42. The definition used for industry was fully compliant with the CES Recommendations (CES Recommendations para. 274) in 39 countries out of 47. Seven countries (Austria, Canada, Finland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Malta and Switzerland) used a definition that was not fully compliant. Most countries did not specify a reason for this. Finland reported having this information only for employed persons instead of the economically active population.

43. The classification used was the ISIC Revision 4 (CES Recommendations para. 275) in 17 countries and Revision 3.1 in 4 countries. Most countries (22) reported using other classification than ISIC, of which 14 countries reported using the European Classification of Economic Activities (NACE) revision 2. Canada and the United States used the North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS 2007). Canada reported also having a concordance table available for NAICS 2007 and ISIC Revision 4.

44. There were eight countries that couldn't provide data in ISIC at all (Liechtenstein, Poland, Belgium, Denmark, the Netherlands, Azerbaijan, Latvia and the United States). Israel, Sweden, Armenia, Belarus, the Czech Republic and the Republic of Moldova are able to convert industry in ISIC Rev.3.1 but not in ISIC Rev.4. Twenty-seven countries announced that they are able to provide data in ISIC-Rev.4. (The total figure should be 30, because three countries that used ISIC-Rev.4 in their census didn't mark this on the questionnaire: Poland, Slovenia, the Czech Republic.)

## **L. Survey question: Non-core economic topics or other economic topics**

45. Non-core economic topics were included in the census in most countries. The most common non-core topic included was the main source of livelihood which was included in the census in 21 countries. All of those countries who included this topic in their census also used definition fully comply with the CES Recommendations.

46. Time usually worked (14 countries), type of place of work (13 countries), and socio economic groups (13 countries) were also quite commonly collected non-core topics. Others were in declining order: Duration of unemployment (nine countries), Number of persons working in the local unit of the establishment (seven countries), Type of sector (institutional unit) (six countries), Income (six countries), Providers of unpaid services, volunteers (three countries), Informal employment (two countries) and Time-related underemployment (only one country).

47. One might expect that non-core topics would not be collected in register-based censuses as often as in traditional censuses. In some cases the situation is quite the opposite. For example in the topics such as the type of sector (institutional unit) and income half of countries who collected these items were register-based. The definition of which topics are included in the census is also quite difficult in some countries with register-based census. This problem was described in this section by the Netherlands: "We restrict our Census 2011 work to core-topics, although information on some of the non-core topics (e.g. main source of livelihood, income) is available in our office".

## II. Revisions to the CES Census Recommendations for the 2020 round on economic characteristics proposed by the UNECE Task Force on economic and educational characteristics

49. There is no obvious need to propose any new core topics on economic characteristics. In the UNECE countries there are few characteristics where the CES Recommendations definitions or classifications are not generally followed.

### A. Classification by activity status (current or usual)

50. Current recommendation on classification of activity status:

- (1.0) Economically active
  - (1.1) Employed
  - (1.2) Unemployed, of which
    - (1.2.1) Unemployed, never worked before
- (2.0) Not economically active
  - (2.1) Students
  - (2.2) Pension or capital income recipients
  - (2.3) Homemakers
  - (2.4) Others

51. New proposed recommendation on classification of activity status:

- (1.0) Economically active
  - (1.1) Employed
  - (1.2) Unemployed
- (2.0) Not economically active
  - (2.1) Students
  - (2.2) Pension or capital income recipients
  - (2.3) Others (including homemakers).

52. Changes proposed to the previous classification:

(a) (2.3) Homemakers and (2.4) Others put into one category (2.3) Others (including homemakers). The distinction between homemakers and others is difficult to determinate and it is not relevant to interpretation of statistics.

(b) Ten countries commented on the UNECE questionnaire, that they do not distinguish homemakers from others or they don't collect that information at all (Albania, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Norway, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and the United States).

(c) Removal of category (1.2.1) Unemployed, never worked before. Duration of unemployment is a topic on its own. There were also several comments from countries that do not collect information on those "unemployed never worked before". This category is also quite small and can be used only at high geographical level. In small areas there will be a significant disclosure risk.

## B. Status in employment (core topic)

53. Current recommendation: it is recommended that the economically active population be classified by status in employment as follows.

(1.0) Employees, among whom it may be possible to distinguish “employees with stable contracts” (including “regular employees”)

(2.0) Employers

(3.0) Own-account workers

(4.0) Contributing family workers

(5.0) Members of producers’ co-operatives

(6.0) Persons not classifiable by status

54. In the international standards of ILO, the term “self-employed” refers to all categories (2.0) to (5.0) in paragraph 280. A “self-employment” job is a job where the remuneration is directly dependent upon the profits (or the potential for profits) derived from the goods and services produced (where own consumption is considered to be part of the profits). Eurostat uses the term “self-employed” to refer to only own-account workers (category (3.0) in paragraph 280). The Eurostat classification does not distinguish members of producers’ co-operatives but includes them in the category of “self-employed”. In the presentation of these Recommendations, ILO terminology has been followed.

55. Proposed new structure of the classification:

(1.0) Employees

(2.0) Self-employed

(2.1) Employers

(2.2) Own-account workers

(2.3) Other self-employed (“Contributing family workers” and “Members of producers’ co-operatives”)

(2.3.1) Contributing family workers (optional)

(2.3.2) Members of producers’ co-operatives (optional)

(3.0) Not stated/Not applicable

56. The new classification combines definitions of ILO, UNECE and Eurostat in a way that most of the countries are able to use it or at least the non-optional part of the classification. This makes it easier to compare between countries.

## III. ILO Comments on proposals for the revision of the CES Recommendations for the 2020 Census round

57. ILO is, at present, in the process of updating the international standards for the measurement of the economically active population contained in the *Resolution concerning statistics of the economically active population, employment, unemployment and underemployment*, adopted by the thirteenth International Conference of Labour Statisticians (ICLS) in 1982 and related guidelines. The revised draft resolution will be presented for discussion and adoption by the nineteenth ICLS on 2-11 October 2013.

58. If adopted, the updated international statistical standards would have implications for the measurement of economic characteristics of the population through Population and Housing Censuses. A list of the main proposed revisions is included in Annex II as background information. At present, ILO can provide general comments on the current proposals for revision of the CES 2020 Census Recommendations. Once the revised draft resolution has been adopted by the nineteenth ICLS, ILO will be in a position to provide more detailed comments.

## **A. Economic Characteristics**

### **1. Classification by activity status**

59. ILO has no problem with the proposal to exclude the sub-category “unemployed, never worked before” from the recommended classification.

60. ILO would recommend retaining the separate identification of “Homemakers” among persons outside the labour force. This functional category is important for social and gender analysis. Its aggregation with “Others” may result in a rather large “Others” category of the population outside the labour force for which no meaningful analysis would be possible. It would also limit the international comparability of the statistics across regions. The information is also used for quality assessments of household survey data. The current proposals to update the international standards for the measurement of the economically active population, recognize unpaid provision of services for own or the household’s final use as a form of work to be measured (separately from employment), in addition, various alternative classifications of the population outside the labour force will also be proposed to serve various needs, including assessment of the labour market attachment of the population outside the labour force, including reasons for not seeking/being available for employment, including household responsibilities.

61. ILO recommends replacing the terms “currently active/inactive” by “labour force/outside the labour force”.

### **2. Status in employment**

62. ILO has no problem with the use of Not stated/Not applicable instead of “Persons not classifiable by status”. This latter category is not a status and should not have been included in ICSE-93.

63. ILO also agrees to make the category “Members of producers’ co-operatives” (MPC) optional. This group is very small in almost all countries and non-existent in many. In those countries that have very small numbers of members of producers’ cooperatives and do not identify them in the Census there is no problem in including them among Own-account workers.

64. ILO does not agree with the proposals to make optional the category “Contributing family workers” (CFW) or to combine it with “Members of producers’ cooperatives”. ILO would recommend that CFW be retained as a category, that MPC be treated as optional and the category “Other self-employed” not be used. Whilst CFW are numerically small in some countries in the region it is a very significant group in many countries. It is important to retain this group for the following reasons:

(a) It frequently reflects a status that is somewhere between employment and either unemployment or inactivity. Significant increases in the frequency of this group are likely to reflect deterioration in labour market conditions, and monitoring such increases during times of economic crisis may be increasingly relevant in many Western European

countries. Moreover, making it optional could potentially encourage countries not to collect it, even in cases where it is a large group.

(b) It should be important to retain the group even in countries where the incidence of contributing family workers is small, in order to provide a comparison with countries from other regions. The relatively low frequency in countries of the UNECE region is a particularly important reason to collect it in the Census, as sampling errors may be high in household surveys. The difficulty of collecting CFW in register-based censuses should be seen as reflecting a limitation of this mode of collection, rather than as a reason not to collect information about this group.

(c) The proposal to aggregate CFW with MPC under the heading “Other self-employed” means that for most countries CFW would simply be relabelled, since the MPC group is virtually non-existent. The label “Other self-employed”, however, understates the importance of this group and makes them statistically invisible to most users. For those countries that have register-based censuses that exclude CFW, low or non-existent numbers for “Other self-employed” could be particularly misleading.

## Annex I

### Comments from Countries on the question in the UNECE Survey: Status in employment — Definition used fully comply with the CES Recommendations? — Yes/No (specify below)

<i>Country</i>	<i>Census method</i>	<i>Comment</i>
Albania	Traditional	The classification used includes points 1. Employees 2. Employers 3. Own-account workers 4. Contributing family workers
Armenia	Traditional	
Austria	Register-based	For the status in employment we also apply the classification according to the Commission Regulation (EC); we do not report the optional attribute “members of producers’ co-operatives” because it is not possible to identify them amongst the own-account workers. 1. Employees 2. Employers 3. Own-account workers 4. Others (“Contributing family workers’ and “Members of producers’ cooperatives”) 4.1. Contributing family workers (optional) 4.2. Members of producers’ cooperatives (optional) 5. Not stated 6. Not applicable
Azerbaijan	Traditional	Used classification: NACE-Rev 1.1
Belarus	Traditional	Classification of employment status was carried out on the basis of national classifications harmonized with ICSE-93 for most groups: Employed Employed (a) with the involvement of employees (b) without the involvement of employees (c) family members working without pay (d) other
Belgium	Register-based	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Traditional	
Bulgaria	Traditional	1. Employer (with employees) 2. Self-employed (without employees) 3. Employee 4. Unpaid family worker (household member working in the family business without payment) 5. Member of a production or agricultural cooperative 6. Agricultural producer for own consumption 7. Never have worked
Canada	Traditional	The NHS does not use the Status in Employment concept as shown above but uses a similar concept labelled “Class of Workers” for which the breakdown is as followed: Employee, Self-employed, Self-employed (incorporated business) Without paid help With paid help

<i>Country</i>	<i>Census method</i>	<i>Comment</i>
		<p>Self-employed (unincorporated business)</p> <p>Without paid help, With paid help, Unpaid family worker,</p> <p>Employee</p> <p>This category includes persons who worked for others in the context of an employer-employee relationship. This includes persons who worked for wages, salaries, commissions, tips, piece-rates, or payments “in kind” (payments in goods or services rather than money).</p> <p>Exclusion: “Employee” does not include working owners of incorporated businesses even though they may receive wages, salaries, commissions, tips, piece-rates, or payments “in kind” (payments in goods or services rather than money).</p> <p>Self-employed</p> <p>This category includes persons whose job consisted mainly of operating a business, farm or professional practice, alone or in partnership. This includes: operating a farm, whether the land is rented or owned; working on a freelance or contract basis to do a job (e.g. architects, private duty nurses); operating a direct distributorship selling and delivering products such as cosmetics, newspapers, brushes and cleaning products; and fishing with own equipment or with equipment in which the person has a share. The business can be incorporated or unincorporated. Self-employed persons include those with and those without paid help. Also included among the self-employed are unpaid family workers. They are persons who work without pay in a business, farm or professional practice owned and operated by another family member living in the same dwelling.</p>
Croatia	Traditional	Category (5.0) “Members of producers’ co-operatives” is not applicable.
Cyprus	Traditional	
Czech Republic	Traditional	
Denmark	Register-based	<p>(1.0) it is not possible to distinguish between employees with stable contracts and regular employees</p> <p>(5.0) it is not possible to distinguish members of producers’ cooperatives</p>
Estonia	Combined	Contributing family workers “Members of producers’ co-operatives” were united as low frequency groups
Finland	Register-based	<p>Status in employment describes the position of the employed in the labour market as follows:</p> <p>(a) wage and salary earners.</p> <p>(b) entrepreneurs.</p> <p>Entrepreneurs cannot be divided into employers and self-employed, sole entrepreneurs. The category of “entrepreneurs” also comprises family members working in the company without pay.</p>
France	Rolling	<p>Are you:</p> <p>(a) self-employed, freelance?</p> <p>(b) a salaried manager, CEO, minority manager of limited liability company?</p> <p>(c) a paid employee or a paid intern?</p>

<i>Country</i>	<i>Census method</i>	<i>Comment</i>
		(d) helping a person in his or her work in an unpaid capacity)?
Georgia	Traditional	
Germany	Combined	
GREECE	Traditional	
Hungary	Traditional	Classification used: Hungarian Classification of Status in Employment is the same as ICSE-93.
Iceland	Register-based	
Ireland	Traditional	The classification used was as follows: (a) Employee (b) Self-employed, with paid employees (c) Self-employed, without paid employees (d) Assisting relative (not receiving a fixed wage or salary) It would not be possible to derive "Members of producers' co-operatives" from this classification nor would it be possible to derive employees with stable contracts.
Israel	Combined	
Italy	Traditional	Italy used a National Classification but we can provide data in ICSE-93
Kazakhstan	Traditional	
Latvia	Traditional	(5.0) "Members of producers' co-operatives" does not exist in Latvia
Liechtenstein	Traditional	
Lithuania	Traditional	The "Members of producers' co-operatives" group were not included in the census questionnaire, because it is not relevant for our country.
Luxembourg	Traditional	
Malta	Traditional	
Montenegro	Traditional	
Netherlands	Register-based	Only a distinction between employers and employees is made.
Norway	Register-based	Family workers not a separate category. Members of producers' co-operatives is not a relevant category. Classification without (4.0) and (5.0)
Poland	Combined	The applied classification: (a) Employees (b) Employers (c) Own-account workers (d) Contributing family workers. On the country's scale "members of producers' cooperatives" comprise a small group. (there are 12.8 thousand members of producers' cooperatives in Poland, source CSO, on the basis of the publication "Employment in national economy in 2010").
Portugal	Traditional	
Republic of Moldova	Traditional	
Romania	Traditional	
Russian Federation	Traditional	
Serbia	Traditional	
Slovakia	Traditional	
Slovenia	Register-based	
Spain	Combined	2001 Census classification. Very similar to ICSE-93 classification
Sweden	Register-based	National classification used. Contributing family workers and members of producers' co-operatives are not included.

<i>Country</i>	<i>Census method</i>	<i>Comment</i>
Switzerland	Combined	Members of producers' co-operatives not available. Classification used: a) Own business (or family business): 1) self-employed without employees (the business is not a stock corporation or public limited company (plc)) 2) self-employed with employees (the business is not a stock corporation or plc) 3) employee in own stock corporation or plc without other employees 4) employee in own stock corporation or plc with other employees 5) relative employed in family business b) Other business: 6) apprentice 7) employed as director or board member 8) employee with managerial responsibility 9) employee without managerial responsibility 10) employee in protected workshop (except support staff)
Tajikistan	Traditional	Used the following classification of status in employment: (a) Employee (b) Employer (c) Engaged on an individual basis (d) Engaged in private farming (e) A member of the cooperative (f) Unpaid family workers (g) Other
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	Traditional	
Turkey	Combined	Not fully compatible with ICSE-93. The categories were: (a) Regular or casual employee (b) Employer (c) Self employed (d) Unpaid family worker
United Kingdom	Traditional	Standard employment status categories used in outputs: (a) Employee (b) Self-employed or freelance (c) Without employees (d) With employees (e) Not in employment. Note: Will be also able to derive "Contributing family workers" for the EU Regulation purposes
Ukraine	Traditional	
United States	Traditional	

## Annex II

### **Scope of proposed revisions to the international standards on statistics of the economically active population, employment, unemployment and underemployment (thirteenth ICLS, 1982) – Drafted by ILO**

1. Work to update the international standards on statistics of the economically active population, employment, unemployment and underemployment (thirteenth ICLS, 1982) was initiated by ILO following recommendations by the eighteenth ICLS and the thirty-ninth session of the United Nations Statistical Commission, both held in 2008. The former recommended future ILO work to revise the current resolution and related guidelines, as well as the International Classification of Status in Employment (ICSE-93) and adopted a Resolution concerning the development of measures of labour underutilization. The latter considered the labour statistics programme review.

2. The proposals to update the current international standards on statistics of the economically active population, employment unemployment and underemployment, include:

(a) A general definition of the concept of Work, aligned with the general production boundary of the System of National Accounts (2008).

(b) Statistical definitions and guidelines for the separate measurement of three distinct forms of work: Employment, Own-use production work and Volunteer work.

(c) A more refined concept and definition of employment that focuses on work for pay or profit, to serve as the basis for the production of labour force statistics.

(d) General definitions and operational guidelines to measure participation in own-use production work (i.e. production of goods and provision of services for own use), and in volunteer work, (i.e. non-compulsory work performed without pay for others).

(e) Detailed operational guidelines to measure employment and unemployment that build on accumulated experience, with the aim of facilitating and improving international comparability.

(f) Emphasis on the use of the current activity framework to classify persons by their labour force status in a short reference period and removal of the usual activity framework that classifies persons into usually active/usually inactive on the basis of their predominant activity in a long reference period.

(g) General guidance on developing classifications of persons outside the labour force for different purposes, including the assessment of their labour market attachment.

(h) Removal of outdated terminology, including the terms “currently active population”, “inactive/not currently active population”, to be replaced by “labour force” and “outside the labour force”.

(i) Other measures of labour underutilization to focus on insufficient absorption of available labour, for dissemination with the unemployment rate.

(j) Guidance for countries at different statistical levels on implementing a rational programme of work and labour force statistics to satisfy short and long-term needs, taking account of the national context and resources.

3. The revised draft resolution to be discussed by the Nineteenth ICLS will be made public in mid-August on the ILO website at [www.ilo.org/19thICLS](http://www.ilo.org/19thICLS).