

**STATISTICAL COMMISSION and
ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE**

CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN STATISTICIANS

**Joint UNECE/Eurostat Seminar on Business Registers
(Luxembourg, 25-26 June 2003)**

WORKING PAPER No 6

ENGLISH ONLY

**ENTERPRISE, EMPLOYMENT, LABOUR INPUT:
DEFINITIONS AND MEASUREMENT PROBLEMS***

Supporting paper submitted by the Italian National Statistical Institute (ISTAT)**

* Prepared by Mr. Manlio Calzaroni and Mr. Giuseppe Garofalo.

** Paper posted on Internet as submitted by ISTAT.

1. Introduction

The articulation currently used in the defining system in the various surveys on enterprises carried out by ISTAT must refer to a single concept framework which, while maintaining its specificity, must also be consistent with what is set out in the European Union regulations.

Measuring and describing employment via the enterprise source means not only identifying the number of people employed but also the type of relationship that determines the characteristics of the working services provided (including the actual number of work carried out and the relative cost) and also the group of enterprises for whom these relationships must be measured (i.e. the total for whom, according to the EU definitions, the production of goods and services must be estimated).

Up to a few years ago, the substantial “linearity” existing in the relationship between enterprise and work allowed us to use the definition of enterprise, employment and self-employment without too many distinctions and with committing important errors in describing and measuring them. Today, due to the complex and varied organisation structure that has developed in the “way of producing” and in the proliferation of various regulations by which working relationships are governed, official statistics are obliged to reanalyse the definitions used to date and also identify the classification paradigms that allow a more analytical and “modular” approach, that can adapt to the varying needs that statistical information must fulfil.

Before analysing the problems connected with measuring enterprising and relative employment, it may be useful to repeat the various information potential that the two observation units used possess for measuring employment: enterprise and families.

The information content within the phenomenon of “employment” found in the families or in the companies has been the subject of attention from ISTAT for several years. Therefore, here, we will limit ourselves to listing the main differences, leaving it to other texts¹ to provide a more detailed analysis: (i) surveys in families basically reveal the number of people employed, while the surveys in companies measure the number of jobs; (ii) surveys in families, at least in Italy, measure the number of people “legally” employed (i.e. employed according to the current laws in force) and “illegally” employed, while surveys in the companies provide the measurement of only the “legal” jobs; (iii) the characteristics of this phenomenon are described according to the information and/or sensitivity of the person interviewed (surveys in families) or according to the laws which the company must abide by (e.g. indications about the economic activity and the type of working relationship can be described differently by the two subjects who supply the information).

These clarifications bring us to consider that any differences found in the estimates obtained from the two information sources do not identify the presence of “errors” but are the result of different interpretations of the same phenomenon. This highlights the differing information capacity of the two sources and underlines that this difference is not a “problem” but an enrichment of the information available to

¹ M. Calzaroni (2000), “Employment, as an instrument for a complete evaluation of the GNP”, ISTAT ,(currently being printed).

analyse real economic phenomena, and we can go on to analyse the problems connected with the definition and measurement of the employment using the enterprise source.

2. The definitions of enterprise, employees and self-employed subjects

Starting with the definitions introduced by European Union regulations, it is necessary to analyse the problems that arise when they must become operational with a reference to the economic and legislative reality in our country.

2.1. Enterprise

The EU Regulations on Statistical Units (no. 696/93) states that “the enterprise is the smaller combination of legal units that is an organizational unit producing goods or services, which benefits from a certain degree of autonomy in decision-making, especially for the allocation of its current resources. An enterprise carries out one or more activities at one or more location. An enterprise may be a sole legal unit”.

From a theoretical point of view, the European definition underlines an important difference in concept between the legal unit (intended as a physical or legal entity acknowledged – inasmuch as they possess rights and duties – by each country’s law-making body) and the statistical unit called “enterprise” (intended as an organisation, or organisational system that produces goods or services and which has autonomous decision-making powers). This distinction is necessary due to the existence of units that, although are correctly and legally recognised from an administrative and legal point of view, do not represent organisational units that produce good or services². On the other hand, the distinction introduced in the European Union definition, as it defines enterprise as “ the smaller combination of legal units”, takes on a strong conceptual value and changes the classic approach used, for example in the Censuses of Industry and Services, i.e. that “an enterprise is a legal unit”³. The definition, in fact, expresses the need to identify and to describe, from an economic and statistical point of view, a reality in evolution that sees the production of goods and services organised into complex systems, that bind several legally recognised units together: because one or more legal units carry out an exclusive auxiliary activity for another legal unit, because several legal units are only different on a formal level, because on the basis of contractual restraints, which are more or less strict, one legal unit can in fact be seen as a part of a wider organisational system.

It is obvious that this defining approach creates particularly complicated practical problems (such as which criteria to adopt to “link” subjects that appear to be different? Which statistical techniques to use? Which information sources to use?). While referring the complete handling of this matter to other documents⁴ and to the experience that is on going in the Italian Business Register (ASIA), we

² A legal unit can have a purely administrative function (fiscal), or cannot yet carry out production even though it is legally recognised, or can have stopped activity though it has not legally declared itself as closed.

³ Note that this operational choice is shared by most countries in the EU.

⁴ G. Garofalo (2000): Enterprises definition: practical problem in its implementation and some possible solutions, “Task Force on Statistical Units”, Luxemburg, 20 December 2000
and

P. Cella, G. Garofalo, A.Paggiaro, N. Torelli, C. Viviano (2001): Enterprise demography: the use of matching techniques for the analysis of continuity. ISTAT, internal document.

believe it necessary to underline the incidence of such phenomena on the economic groups and the structural indicators that are surveyed. For example, events that are very frequent in large enterprises, such as the parcelling out of auxiliary activities (Personnel management, accounting etc) into separate legal units produce “false” changes in employment and in the economic groups to the advantage of some sectors (services) rather than others⁵.

This reality causes problems, not only from a practical point of view, but also from a theoretical one, making it necessary, if not to change the definitions currently used, at least to rethink the rules that determine the operational application.

2.2. Self-employed subjects

2.2.1. European definitions and the Italian reality

In Europe the regulations on structural statistics do not provide a definition for self-employed workers. The Eurostat glossary for enterprise statistics⁶ only refers to the definition given in the context of the European System of Accounts⁷ and the European Union Survey on Labour Force.

Within the ESA the definition of “self-employed” is: those people who are the sole owners, or joint owners of enterprises that are not set up as companies within which they work, excluding the enterprises classified as almost companies. This category also includes:

- Non-paid family workers;
- Home workers whose income depends on the value of the products of some production processes for which they are responsible;
- Workers that carry out production activities that are done exclusively for their own use or for investments;
- Non-paid voluntary workers only if their activity results in products.

The regulations do not classify as “self employed” those who, in addition to the activities described, carry out a paid activity if this is their main activity.

A consequence of this definition is that for companies or for almost companies, there can be no self-employed figure. On the other hand, within the context of national accounts, there is a definition of an “employee” as who “by contract” works for another institutional unit and receives “remuneration” for his work.

A sub-group of subjects is therefore created that do not work by contract, nor are paid by companies and almost companies that cannot be placed in this classification.

In the European Union Survey on Labour Force, the person who works in the enterprise belonging to himself and who aims to derive a profit from it⁸ is defined as “self employed” (“Autonomous or collaborating consultant” in the Italian

⁵ The handling of data by Functional Unit, instead of by enterprise does not solve the problem.

⁶ EUROSTAT (1996), Glossary of Business Statistics.

⁷ EUROSTAT (1996), European Accounting System - SEC 1995.

⁸ ISTAT, Survey on the labour forces, instructions for surveyors.

questionnaire). Within a specific question to these subjects, the position classified in the following manner is requested:

- *Entrepreneur*: he who manages and owns the enterprise in which he employs staff
- *Professional*: who works for himself in a free professional or art;
- *Self-employed worker*: he who manages an agricultural activity, a small industrial company,.... Taking part and working himself...but without employees;
- *Worker with a permanent and coordinated contract of work*: who provides his own work services without the restraint of subordination;
- *Worker with an occasional work contract*: who occasionally provides his own work services without the restraint of subordination and completes his own production cycle in a single service;
- *Partner in a cooperative*;
- *Family worker*.

Both the definitions given, though different, seem to link the concept of “self-employed” to those enterprises that can “legally” be generally classified as “individual or family enterprise” or “Professional”. Therefore, for all forms of organisation where there is no “identification” between the owner physical subject and the activity carried out, such as partnerships and joint-stock companies, the “workers” (or employees) of the company do not consider the position of “self-employed”.

This “concept” choice is not justified either from an empirical point of view or from a legal-administrative point of view.

- From an empirical point of view: the companies, both the ISTAT questionnaires and the Chambers of Commerce (CCIAA) declarations, often declare the presence of “self-employed” workers. Referring to structural surveys on enterprises, in 50% of joint-stock companies and in 60% of partnerships⁹ there are self-employed workers. Also, the average number of self-employed workers is much higher in partnerships than in individual enterprises (2.2 and 1.3 respectively). Not considering the self-employed person in some organisation types of enterprise would mean reducing the enterprise population by about 20%. More than 600 thousand companies (partnerships or joint-stock companies) do not have employed staff, even though they declare a substantial volume of business.
- From a legal-administrative point of view: current legislation, in addition to identifying a close connection between partnerships and their partners¹⁰, also recognises a whole series of “forms” in which a company identifies itself with the role of partner: from unlimited partnerships to companies of professionals. Also, more than 30% of the handcraft and commercial enterprises are legally registered as partnerships and the “owners”, craftsmen

⁹ G. Garofalo (1998), “The problem of self-employed workers in the surveys of enterprises. Definition and evaluation of missing data” (internal document)

¹⁰ The law-making body has acknowledged imperfect asset autonomy to partnerships, making the company assets only partly unaffected by the matters concerning the individual assets of the partners.

and shopkeeper partners, have social security and insurance obligations (for accidents in the workplace) that are the same as those that individual entrepreneurs have and are therefore assimilated to these by both Social security office (INPS) and Work accident insurance institute (INAIL).

In both the context of the national accounts and that of structural statistics, for these considerations, the previous definitions are interpreted in a wider manner and in fact partners and directors who take part in managing the enterprise and who work there without having a set contractual remuneration are considered among the “self-employed” workers¹¹.

The conceptual approach on which enterprise statistics is based must take into account the specificity of the Italian model and must therefore be, in some way, obtained by the European definitions. The concept of self-employed worker must consequently take this into account. If the basic concept of the definition of enterprise is that of being an “organisation of economic activity”, the definition of self-employed must be centred on the concept of “he who organises, autonomously, an economic activity, without a preset remuneration, with the purpose of gaining a profit”.

Evidently, a definition that is based on the concepts of “organisation” and “profit” generate contradictions within the joint-stock companies. By definition these enterprises are not based around the concept of physical subject that carries out the activity of entrepreneur and who “organises the work” does not always coincide with who receives the profit (these are often other legal entities).

The problems shown are not easy to solve, different choices can influence considerably on the amount of self-employed people, and therefore on the overall estimate of the jobs. The goal that we have, as official statistics, is linked to the need to use choices that, starting from European Union definitions, allows us to reach a definition group that can describe the economic reality of our country.

ISTAT has still not produced this set of definitions, even though, for obvious reasons, whoever has found himself in the position of dealing with this subject has found himself forced to adopt solutions that prevent the occurrence of paradoxical situations (such as the one recalled previously of 600 thousand companies without employees). The solutions adopted to date have two characteristics:

1. the single meaning of the concept approach (within statistics on enterprises), i.e. looking at the functional aspect from which it emerges that “each enterprise must have at least one person who organises the business”;
2. the non-singularity of the methods adopted, with consequent possible difference in the figures obtained.

We believe that we can state that a solution to this problem can no longer be delayed and therefore we feel able to propose this as one of the Laboratory’s priorities.

¹¹ Even though the notes and the definitions that accompany the various questionnaires are different (not only slightly) this is generally the sense that is given to the concept of “self-employed”.

2.2.2. A grey area inside self-employment

A second aspect that determines the creation of problems in identifying the self-employed figure is linked to the EU definition of enterprise. It is obvious that what has been said about the difficulties of applying the European Union definitions to some types of enterprise (paragraph 2.1) also has consequences for the identification and measurement of self-employment.

As has already been said, the way of organising an enterprise can be “complex” (both for large and small enterprises), several legal units can be “linked” to each other by functional restraints, determined by factors that are the result of administrative-fiscal and/or industrial strategies. These links include, for example, the choice of decentralising some auxiliary activities (administration, computer systems, transport etc) into different legal units, the choice of decentralising “part” of the product manufacture or the processes to other units, which are then tied by varying degrees of obligation contracts, the choice of organising the sales network by entrusting the matter to various legal units who are then tied to the company in some way in order to guarantee a common product image.

All these organisational systems presume different levels of “relationship” of one legal unit to another. The self-employed worker in these legal units therefore loses a part of his characteristics. His autonomy can be reduced considerably, up to the point of reaching characteristics of an unregistered corporation, which is “subordinate” to decisions (concerning investment, management, marketing, image) taken elsewhere.

This “grey area” of self-employed work takes on different aspects (from “links” to total subordination – ancillary businesses – to “links” that guarantee greater independence – licensing) that are difficult to identify, classify and estimate.

What we wish to underline here is that not considering the concept of the complexity of the organisational structures of enterprises (the enterprise systems) and the impact that they have on defining work input, can bring about some statistical and economic assessments that do not reflect reality. Briefly, the problem to be addressed is: once the link between several enterprises has been identified and it has been established that they make up a single *organisational unit*, from a statistical point of view, how must a self-employed person within this unit be classified?

The answer that we believe should be given to this reality, within the context of the ASIA archives, is that of identifying and noting the links that exist between companies, as shown in the conclusion, while continuing to use the enterprise identified by a single legal unit as units of “registration”.

2.3. Employees

With regards to this category, there do not seem to be any big problems of definition, given their identification as groups of working positions that correspond to the people “registered in the pay roll”. The problems connected with the presence, in enterprises, of people who have working relationships that are different from this one but who contribute to the production, are contained in the next section. The problems that exist today in the operational application of the definition of employed workers are connected to the various types of relationships that can be activated and their quantification.

The types of relationship that exist between employee and enterprise can vary in duration (fixed term and permanent), the working time (full time, part time), and the laws that govern it (solidarity, socially useful projects, apprenticeship, etc.). These differences can also imply differences in salary and in labour costs. The importance of these parameters is such as to make their measurement inevitable, considering the consequences that they have on the estimates that ISTAT must produce in the surveys on enterprises and in the National Accounts (NA).

A first analysis of these types was carried out during the review of estimations of the NA. Some forms were arranged that, according to the main types of working relationships, identified the effects that the specific laws have on the estimates of some groups (salary, labour costs, amount of work provided), and also the administrative sources that, potentially can provide information that is useful for statistical purposes. During the last few months this work has been updated, taking into consideration the new types of working relationships that have been activated and expanding the description of those that were already included¹². A brief picture of the types that have currently been identified, on the basis of the importance for statistical purposes is contained in Table 1.

Table 1 - Types of contract according to duration of contract, way in which work is carried out and the working time.

TYPE OF CONTRACT AND DURATION OF CONTRACT	MODE OF CARRYING OUT WORK AND WORKING HOURS						
	Classical*		Home work	Agency work		Tale work	
	Full time	Part time		Full time	Part time	Full time	Part time
Permanent contracts							
- Typical contracts	x		x	x		x	
- part-time contracts		x			x		x
- Job sharing	x						
Fixed term contracts							
- Apprenticeship	x	x					
- fixed-term contracts	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
- Training and work	x	x				x	x
- Solidarity contracts		x					x
- work grants	x	x					
- socially useful projects		x					
- traineeship or work experience**							
- Professional introduction plan		x					

*The classical way in which a subordinate job is carried out is clearly that at the traditional workplace

**In a traineeship or work experience contract, no working hours are set.

¹² N. Di Veroli, R. Rizzi, Proposals for classification of subordinate working relationships and self-employment an analysis of the legal context, ISTAT, 2002.

2.4 The intermediate figures – Permanent and Co-ordinated Collaborators

This section illustrates the problems connected with the statistical handling of the working relationship of Permanent and Co-ordinated Collaborators (henceforth referred to as **CCCs**), which is the most relevant type, at least in quantity, of working relationships apart from those previously described¹³.

The CCC type of working relationship covers, basically, a wide range of types, that go from the relationship that is, in fact, a “change” on the employee, to the activity of a consultant that is similar to that of a Self-employed. From a legal point of view, all the types included between these two extremes can be subjected to the same obligations: registration in the INPS fund and/or setting up of a VAT registration number.

The problem which arises is if and when to handle the activities carried out by these subjects as “self-employed” activities, i.e. when to associate them to the concept of an enterprise, or, to the contrary, when to assimilate these people to a “subordinate” activity, which is similar of that of an enterprise’s employees. The solution must be such that it respects the European Union definitions and takes into consideration the legislative situation that has been created in Italy.

The proposed classification is possible thanks to the information added value that has been obtained from the integration of different sources¹⁴. For example, linking information about “the holding of a VAT registration number” with that that allows the identification of whether a CCC works, in a determined time period, for one company only or for several companies. In particular, three different classifications are being proposed for the CCC group:

1. Those registered at INPS such as the CCC, who possess a VAT registration number, are considered as “enterprises” (and therefore self-employed) regardless of how INPS classifies them (professional and non) and without taking into consideration the number of companies for whom they work. All these subjects are already present in the information base which creates the ASIA;
2. The CCC without a VAT registration number can be assimilated to an “enterprise” when, during the reference period, they set up a working relationship with more than one enterprise. In this case they would become a new economic unit to be included in the ASIA.
3. The CCCs without a VAT registration number who, during the reference period, provide their services to a single enterprise, can be considered as a further quantity of work used by the enterprise, but do not come under the head of enterprises registered in ASIA.
4. With regards to the economic activity that must be attributed to the economic units identified in this way, the proposal to be discussed here is the one used for National Accounts (NA) evaluations. If the declared economic activity outlines an activity that is similar to production repair or maintenance of particular products, these units are classified in their

¹³ Similar reflections must be developed for other types, starting with the descriptions given in the work by Di Veroli – Rizzi.

¹⁴ Other information available at the holding body of the administrative activity (in this case INPS) and information contained in other administrations (tax offices).

respective production sectors; otherwise they are classified in the services sectors.

Though we believe that it would be suitable to classify CCCs in a position which is separate from that of self-employed people or the employees of a company, one problem of consistency is caused by the European Union classifications that only foresee the two positions of self-employed or employed. This problem must be thought about as if it is true that, consistently with the macroeconomics pictures provided by the NA, these figures can only be assimilated to “self-employed” work it is also true that, aside from any socio-economic consideration, there are laws, issued after the first definition of the CCC group, that makes them similar, from a contributions point of view, to employees of a company.

3. The labour input

The problem of evaluating the quantity of work used by one economic unit is not only of interest to the NA which, by definition, must evaluate, within the SNA/ESA frameworks, the input of work, i.e. the quantity of work that underlies a determined production. The evolution of enterprises’ organisational systems and the complex reality of working relationships, makes it necessary to attend once again to this problem on the level of a micro analysis, i.e. that which is closest to those that deal with enterprise surveys. In other words, we believe that in order to carry out analyses on the production system it is not enough to define the quantity of work that underlies the production of a certain enterprise as that carried out by the employees (defined as the employed and self-employed workers). In addition to the classical analyses there must be, at least, the introduction of analyses that take into account the total quantity of work used by an enterprise.

The problem of identifying and measuring this latter amount can be dealt with by using two main instruments:

- The introduction of another category (in addition to employees and self-employed workers), defined as “other personnel used by the enterprise” or “personnel outside the enterprise” (as defined in Industrial census 2001);
- The introduction of a detail, for employees and self-employed people, which allows the calculation of the actual quantity of work used by an enterprise (Table 1 must be intended as an instrument for attributing the relative quantity of work and the corresponding cost to each type of working relationship).

The target is that of succeeding in expanding the information on an enterprise, linking to it the information necessary to evaluate the actual quantity of work supplied by employees and by self-employed workers (not only their number) and that provided by those who we defined above as “personnel outside the enterprise”.

Not taking into account this date would cause errors in the both macro and micro analyses. Some CCC workers for example, as they are not employees of the enterprise and are not considered to be enterprises themselves, would be totally ignored by the statistical system for enterprises. Another example, originating from totally different laws, is that of temporary workers. They are present in our archives and in our surveys as employees of temporary employment enterprises, but it is obvious that in order to analyse the quantity of work used by an enterprise to

produce a determined amount of goods and/or services, the workers who are obtained via this type of working relationship must be taken into consideration.

4. Conclusions – The proposed classification scheme

Returning to what was said in the introduction about the need for non-static classification schemes that allow the labour market to be described in different ways depending on the purposes that are set, a classification scheme for enterprises and employment is proposed here, that in addition to reflecting this subject, is also consistent with the classifications and definitions that have been set within the European Union context and which have an actual possibility of being achieved, i.e. for which sufficient information is available for it to be carried out, at least on an annual basis. This classification must be based on the following restrictions:

1. to be consistent with the European classification schemes;
2. to guarantee continuity of the historical series of information, especially of structural surveys produced by the Institute;
3. to introduce new professional figures;
4. to also consider the definition of enterprise as “ a smaller combination of legal units”;
5. to be really applicable

The first four restrictions guarantee the possibility of having “flexible” classification schemes. The fifth one can be respected via an integrated use of several administrative information sources (especially INPS, INAIL and inland revenue offices), that record information about both physical subjects (employees, of all types, self-employed workers, CCCs, temporary workers etc) and on economic units correctly.

This approach is at the same time simple – the presence of enterprises’ and individuals’ taxpayer’s codes makes it extremely easy to physically integrate information – and complex – the information held by administrative sources is not always clear for the use and does not always possess the quality requisites to make it immediately useful for statistical purposes.

The proposed scheme, that constitutes the evolution of the ASIA, introduces two further types of information alongside (and independently) the classical figures identified by the current accounting schemes such as enterprise workers¹⁵: (i) workers with other types of work contracts; (ii) the contracts that link up the activities of various enterprises (“legal units”).

This means, for example, that for each enterprise the following must be identified: CCCs and temporary workers who work for that enterprise; the enterprises and/or employees of economical units that are formally separate but whose activities are actually linked to the production of another production unit.

Table 2 summarises the proposed approach. The economic units that correspond to the currently used definition (an enterprise – one legal unit) are shown. For calculating the work input used by one enterprise, five types of enterprise are used, that, with the information that is currently available and the

¹⁵ Here the term workers is intended as is commonly used in ISTAT surveys, i.e. the total of self-employed workers and employees.

statistical methods that have already been developed, we believe are possible to actually take into consideration¹⁶. The type are: autonomous enterprises (which also includes professionals), the enterprises that carry out temporary work services, enterprises that carry out auxiliary activities for another enterprise, CCCs with no VAT registration number who start up a work relationship with several enterprises (point 2 of §2.4) and who are therefore classified as “pseudo-legal units” and finally, all those subjects (CCCs with VAT registration numbers – point 1 of §2.4) who work for one or more enterprises.

The columns describe the different types of work used. The jobs are distinguished in the “direct” positions, i.e. all the positions that in an “exclusive” manner – by contract or not – and in a determined time period belong to a specific legal unit. Within these positions, in addition to the employees and self-employed workers of an enterprise, the Collaborators identified in point 3 of § 2.4 are also considered. The value ‘Y’ represents the total of working positions (no duplications) with reference to all enterprises.

Next to the direct positions come the positions defined as “indirect”, as they refer “in an administrative manner” to a unit (for example they are entered in the payroll of agency work), which represent, in their various types, the work input for the production of goods and services of another legal unit (autonomous enterprise). The positions identified are:

- ancillary activities: all the jobs in the ancillary enterprise are traced to the enterprise that this ancillary unit depends on,
- temporary work activity: the autonomous enterprise are attributed with the positions (a1) of the employees of the temporary work enterprise that it actually used, for the period of time for which it uses them.
- CCCs with or without a VAT registration number: the autonomous enterprise is attributed with the work provided by Collaborators (who are considered as separate legal units), for the period in which the services are provided.

Table 2. – Classification of enterprises and jobs

Type of enterprise	Working positions (jobs) in the enterprise								Total Positions
	Direct positions				Indirect positions				
	Workers		CCC	Total pos.	Temp. Work.	Ancill. work	CCC No VAT	CCC with VAT	
	Empl.	Self-empl.							
1. Autonomous Enterprise:	X1	X2	X3	X'	a1	B''	c''	d''	X''
2. Temp work enterprise	A1	A2	A3	A'	-	-	c''	d''	A''
3. Ancillary enterprise	B1	B2	B3	B'	a1	-	c''	d''	B''
4. CCC no VAT	-	C2	-	C'	-	-	-	-	C''
5. CCC with VAT	-	D2	-	D'	-	-	-	-	D''
Total of enterprises	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y'	-	-	-	-	-

¹⁶ For other types, described in the document such as the enterprises that have contractual restraints, we believe that the current analytical instruments are still insufficient for them to be correctly handled statistically.

The true application of the concept scheme described supposes the correct classification and registration of the links that run between the various legal units and therefore, as already previously mentioned (§2.1), an analysis of the sources available and the development of appropriate statistical methods.

The experimental activity started up by ISTAT, has already allowed the identification of the most suitable solutions for identifying the part of temporary work associated with a specific autonomous enterprise (via information acquired from INAIL) and the links that exist between the enterprises and the collaborators (integration of INPS funds and The Tax Register).

A more complicated matter is that of the identification of the ancillary enterprises. By definition an enterprise is ancillary if its activity (a service) is destined wholly at facilitating the production of another enterprise. It is obvious how the identification of an ancillary is possible, currently, only via a direct investigation on the enterprise premises and can therefore only be carried out for large enterprises. Another problem is found when the ancillary enterprise “serves” the production of several autonomous enterprises (that may carry out different activities) that belong to the same group. In this case, the problem is that of identifying a method that allows the ancillary work to be divided up between the different enterprises.
