Организация Объединенных Наций ECE/CES/GE.41/2014/2

Экономический и Социальный Совет

Distr.: General
31 October 2015
Russian
Original: English

Европейская экономическая комиссия

Конференция европейских статистиков

Группа экспертов по переписям населения и жилищного фонда

Шестнадцатое совещание
Женева, 23−26 сентября 2014 года

Доклад о работе сессии

I. Введение

1. Шестнадцатое совещание совместной Группы экспертов ЕЭК ООН/Евростата по переписям населения и жилищного фонда состоялось 23−26 октября 2014 года во Дворце Наций в Женеве.

2. На нем присутствовали участники из Австрии, Азербайджана, Албании, Армении, Беларуси, Боснии и Герцеговины, бывшей югославской Республики Македония, Венгрии, Грузии, Германии, Ирландии, Испании, Италии, Казахстана, Канады, Кыргызстана, Латвии, Литвы, Люксембурга, Нидерландов, Норвегии, Польши, Португалии, Республики Корея, Республики Молдова, Российской Федерации, Сербии, Словакии, Словении, Соединенного Королевства, Соединенных Штатов Америки, Таджикистана, Турции, Узбекистана, Финляндии, Франции, Черногории, Чешской Республики, Швейцарии, Швеции, Эстонии и Японии.

3. Европейская комиссия была представлена участниками из Евростата. В совещании также приняли участие представители Статистического отдела Организации Объединенных Наций (СООНН), Института статистики Организации Объединенных Наций по вопросам образования, науки и культуры (ЮНЕСКО), Международной организации труда (МОТ), Продовольственной и сельскохозяйственной организации (ФАО), Управления Верховного комиссара Организации Объединенных Наций по делам беженцев (УВКБ ООН), Управления Верховного комиссара Организации Объединенных Наций по правам человека (УВКПЧ) и Межгосударственного статистического комитета Содружества Независимых Государств (СНГ-Стат). В совещании по приглашению секретариата также приняли участие эксперты Европейской федерации национальных организаций, работающих с бездомными (ФЕАНТСА), Международного проекта в области интегрированных микроданных общего пользования и Лондонского университета.

GE.15-01852 (R) 020315 030315

1501852

4. Финансовую поддержку участию ряда экспертов оказали Российская Федерация и Европейский союз.

II. Организация совещания

5. Г-н Ян Уайт (Соединенное Королевство) был избран Председателем, а г-н Эрик Шульте Нордхолт (Нидерланды) − заместителем Председателя совещания.

6. Участники обсудили следующие основные пункты повестки дня:

a) методология переписи;

b) технология переписи;

c) практические аспекты переписей;

d) управление качеством;

e) категории переписного населения;

f) географические признаки;

g) миграционные и этнокультурные признаки;

h) экономические признаки и сельское хозяйство;

- экономические признаки;
- сельское хозяйство;

i) образовательные признаки;

j) демографические признаки, признаки по домохозяйствам и семьям;

k) жилищные признаки;

l) инвалидность.

7. Основой для обсуждения на совещании послужили документы, с которыми можно ознакомиться на веб-сайте ЕЭК ООН по адресу http://www.unece.org/stats/documents/2014.09.census1.html. Презентации в формате "PowerPoint" будут размещены на той же веб-странице.

8. Участники совещания высоко оценили работу целевых групп ЕЭК ООН, Руководящей группы по переписям населения и жилищного фонда и руководителей обсуждений, которые направляли обсуждения по различным основным вопросам.

9. В приложении к настоящему докладу приводится резюме обсуждений основных пунктов повестки дня, которое будет распространено среди участников по электронной почте после совещания.

III. Будущая работа

10. Секретариат ЕЭК ООН проинформировал участников о следующих запланированных шагах по завершению работы над рекомендациями КЕС:

a) к декабрю 2014 года: завершение работы над проектом рекомендаций КЕС;

b) январь 2015 года: представление Бюро КЕС;

c) 17−18 февраля 2015 года: обсуждение на совещании Бюро КЕС;

d) февраль−апрель 2015 года: электронные консультации со всеми членами КЕС;

e) 15–17 июня 2015 года: обсуждение на пленарной сессии КЕС.

11. Участники совещания предложили следующую программу будущей работы:

a) создать на Вики "Перепись" ЕЭК ООН новую страницу для сбора материалов о примерах перехода от одной методологии переписи к другой;

b) провести 28–29 сентября 2015 года (дата требует подтверждения) рабочее совещание ЕЭК ООН по переписям для стран Восточной Европы, Кавказа и Центральной Азии для обсуждения, предварительно, следующей темы:

Обзор возможных видов использования регистров, административных данных, опроса через Интернет и других инновационных технологий в целях переписей;

c) провести 30 сентября − 2 октября 2015 года (дата требует подтверждения) совместное совещание ЕЭК ООН − Евростата по переписям населения и жилищного фонда для обсуждения, предварительно, следующих вопросов:

i) результаты или планы проведения пробных обследований в целях раунда переписей 2020 года;

ii) результаты работы стран, использующих регистры и обследования, в целях соблюдения новых рекомендаций в отношении раунда переписей 2020 года;

iii) опыт, касающийся пользователей переписи: кто они, что им требуется, в какой степени они задействуются;

iv) перепись в период ужесточения финансовых ограничений;

v) сеточная статистика: возможности и проблемы.

IV. Утверждение доклада

12. Настоящий доклад был утвержден на заключительном заседании совещания.

Annex

English only

Summary of the main issues discussed at the substantive sessions

A. Census methodology

Documentation: Papers submitted by Italy (WP 15), Estonia (WP 16), Montenegro (WP 18), and UNECE Task Force on Census Methodology (WP 3). Presentation by the United States.

Discussion leader: Eric Schulte Nordholt (Netherlands)

1. In the first part of the session, three presentations were given by Italy, Estonia, and the United States. The presenters were asked to clarify some issues covered in the presentations.

2. Concerning the work carried out in Italy for the 2021 census, the presenter clarified that it is planned that data on registered residence (from the population registers) will be used, and corrected on the basis of the results of the special census coverage sample survey.

3. With regard to the plans by Estonia to use data from registers for the next census, the presenter reported that a positive reaction is expected from the public in general, and that already for the 2011 census many people had asked why data from registers were not used. Concerning costs, the register-based census planned in 2021 is not expected to be cheaper than the 2011 census (based mainly on internet data collection) but will provide a platform and tools that will be used also for other surveys, and data will be provided on an annual basis.

4. Concerning the United States, pre-registration – currently being tested – could be used for the 2020 census if it is considered to be cost effective. The Census Bureau will try to reduce the costs of the next census, taking into account legal and quality constraints.

5. In the second part of the session, the discussion leader presented the new draft CES Recommendations on methodology. In the discussion that followed, some countries reported that they would like to see clear advice concerning what kind of census methodology should be adopted. It was clarified that with regard to census methodology and technology the CES recommendations provide information only on the possible options and their implications, and that each country should then choose the best method for its context. There is no one "best method" that is appropriate for all countries. Different countries have different data sources available and work within different legal constraints.

6. It was suggested to make better use of cross-references to the UNSD Principles and Recommendations (P&R) with regard to topics on which that document may provide more detailed information. This could best be done by adding a single reference the P&R at the beginning of the text rather than having several references within the text.

7. Some participants suggested that the text on the essential features of the censuses should be revised, noting that some of the emerging methodologies do not seem to fully

meet all the criteria. However, it was noted that the current text on essential features is the same text of the CES Recommendations for the 2010 round, which was revised taking into account the emerging methodologies, adopting a "broader" interpretation of the essential features.

8. Some participants noted that since many countries are moving from the traditional census method to new approaches, it would be useful to cover these "methodological transitions" in the census recommendations. However, in practice many different transitions could be considered given the large number of methods, and it would not be practical to describe all of them in the recommendations. UNECE observed that quite a lot of material on "methodological transitions" is available in papers produced in the last few years by countries for expert meetings and for various publications. This material could be presented on a new page in the UNECE Census Wiki on this topic. Moreover, a session of the 2015 UNECE-Eurostat expert meeting on censuses could be dedicated to methodological transitions. These proposals were accepted. The participants were also informed that special EFTA courses on the use of registers in social statistics (especially in censuses) are given by Statistics Norway and Statistics Netherlands.

9. Several participants commented that the use of terms like "de facto" or "de jure" census or enumeration (in para. 52) should be limited as far as possible, as these terms may be interpreted with different meanings (i.e. "de jure population" can be used for "legal population"). In UNSD's Principles and Recommendations, the corresponding terms "usual resident" or "present population" are used. However, it was also noted that readers may be confused if "de jure" and "de facto" terminology is completely removed from the Recommendations. It was agreed to use preferably and consistently the terms "usual resident" or "present population". If the terms "de jure" and "de facto" are to be used, then their meaning should be explicitly explained.

10. With regard to terminology, it was also agreed to replace in para. 105 the term "nationality" with "citizenship".

11. It was noted that the text on necessary conditions for the two types of combined census (in sections XI and XII) should be reviewed, taking into account that some of the conditions apply to both methods, while others apply to one method only.

12. It was also proposed to emphasize the importance of small area data as one of the key elements of the census. With reference to the advantages and disadvantages of the various methods, explicit references should be made to the capacity and quality of the methods to produce small area statistics.

B. Census technology

Documentation: Paper submitted by the UNECE Task Force on Census Technology (WP 4).

Discussion leader: Janusz Dygaszewicz (Poland)

13. The discussion leader presented the main changes in draft text for the CES Recommendation for the 2020 census round. Changes concerning outsourcing were presented by Ian White (United Kingdom).

14. With regard to outsourcing, the Italian representative noted the importance of establishing a good cooperation with the contractors. The experts from NSI should have specific knowledge and ability in this field. It is important to have a group of people dedicated to deal with contracts, monitoring, oversee quality, and smooth things over with statisticians. Adequate project management tools should also be used. It was agreed to add

in para. 16 a reference to appropriate knowledge and ability to deal with contractors, required on the side of the NSI, and to add a reference to a "dedicated team" in para. 19.

15. Concerning technology for census field data collection, the representative from Spain suggested considering opportunities for using new applications for smartphones to collect basic information from phone users (e.g. through apps, SMS). Some participants had reservations about the potential of mobile phones for use in data collection, due to the small size of the screens. It was agreed to add a reference with appropriate text in the section on the Internet response option.

16. The representative from Estonia suggested that a guide to appropriate technologies for use in the combined approach would be useful, including descriptions of the various activities, and examples how to properly manage the census. There are a number of challenges, especially in technology (e.g. how to predict enumeration workload and response rates?). It was noted that this type of technical guidance may not fit well within the census recommendations. The Steering Group may want to consider this issue.

17. Several countries made comments on the possible use of "Big data" for the census (in particular the use of mobile phone data). Italy noted that IT solutions used in Big data differ from those implemented in statistical surveys. Future efforts should aim to apply the new methodology to use these sources. Important challenges concern the availability of these sources and financial issues. Some participants noted that the statistical use of Big data is still only at its very early stages and it may be premature to refer specifically to this as a potential data source in the recommendations. However, others suggested referring to Big data in the chapter on methodology.

18. It was observed that the chapter should not be too specific or speculative about potential new technologies.

19. A number of editorial changes were also agreed, including:

a) para 3, 7 and 8 – delete repeated references to international cooperation;

b) para 28 - remove the name of standard SSL 128;

c) para 42 - replace "hand held devices" by "mobile devices"; review text about "charging sources" (perhaps not necessary considering technological progress) and "avoid system updates" (system updates could be necessary to fix possible bugs);

d) para 47a and b – replace "census reference number" by "unique identification number", or leave "census reference number" in para 47a because of the reference to this phrase;

e) para 47c – delete the reference to "Short Messaging Service (Sms) or text message", or possibly replace with more generic term like "short message text service".

C. Population bases

Documentation: Paper submitted by the UNECE Task Force on Population bases and geographic characteristics (WP 7).

Discussion leader: Giampaolo Lanzieri (Eurostat)

20. UNECE informed the meeting that the census workshop for countries in Eastern Europe and Central Asia held on 22 September had led to the following proposals for changes to the draft recommendations:

a) To retain para 162 f) of the 2010 CES recommendations, which specifies that the general rule on place of usual residence applies to persons in compulsory military service.

b) To modify the title of Table 1 to specify that the table applies to workers and students living away from family home for more than 12 months.

c) In table 1, second line (workers in the country not returning regularly to family home), the last column should read "own address" or "place of work" instead of "term time".

21. Concerning proposal a), the discussion leader clarified that paragraph 162 was proposed for deletion since the level of detail was of that of a handbook, rather than recommendations. However, the Steering Group will consider reintroducing in the recommendations the sentence on persons in military service (previously in para. 162 f).

22. Proposal b) above was accepted, and it was suggested to replace in the title "Rules" with "Guidelines".

23. For proposal c), it was suggested replacing for workers "term-time address" with "work-time address".

24. The participants suggested removing the fourth sentence in para. 1 (starting with "While for previous censuses…"), and asked if the word "enumerated" in the first sentence of para. 7 (definition of population count) was necessary.

25. A possible conflict was noted between paragraphs 10 (specifying a 12-month cut off period) and 19 (with an implicit cut off period of 6 months corresponding to "most of the time"). The discussion leader clarified that if the concept of continuous time is retained, then para 19a is a special subcase. Similarly para 18b is a special case. It should also be stressed that paragraphs 18b and 19 apply to those who regularly live in more than one country.

26. It was suggested that in Table 1, the terms "family nucleus" and "term-time address" may require definition. UNECE noted that a definition of family nucleus is given in the chapter on households and families, but a cross reference could be added.

27. UNESCO asked to clarify the relation between ISCED levels and place of usual residence. The discussion leader clarified that the main aim of these recommendations was to allocate those in primary and secondary education at their home address. UNESCO suggested that students at ISCED levels 0 (early childhood education) and 4 (post-secondary non-tertiary education) should be counted at the same address as for primary education, and suggested changing the footnote to include levels 0 and 4. It was also agreed to replace the term "in primary or secondary education" with "in levels of education below tertiary" in Table 1.

28. Several countries commented on whether the family home or the term-time address should be considered as the usual residence for tertiary students. As for the previous CES census recommendations it was not possible to establish a consensus.

29. Some countries supported counting tertiary students at the family home, noting that this would improve coverage and reduce overcount due to duplication. Moreover, counting students at term-time address would have a significant impact on the age structure of the population, particularly in small countries where many young people study abroad.

30. Other countries supported counting tertiary students at the term-time address, noting that tertiary education is generally the point at which a person starts to break away from their family nucleus, and that some university towns can double in population during term-time.

31. The discussion leader suggested as a possible solution that students who regularly return to their home address could be counted at that address, whereas those who did not could be counted at their term-time address. Some participants commented that this proposal would be difficult to operationalize.

32. UNSD informed that for the global Principles and Recommendations for Population and Housing Censuses the term-time address is considered as the place of usual residence for tertiary students. Some participants stressed the importance of consistency of recommendations for the sake of comparability.

33. UNECE suggested giving priority to the term-time address (as it was in the CES recommendations for the 2010 round, and to be consistent with the new revision of the global Principles and Recommendations), but possibly recognizing that some variation exists amongst countries. The proposal was accepted.

D. Geographic characteristics

Documentation: Paper submitted by the UNECE Task Force on Population bases and geographic characteristics (WP 7).

Discussion leader: Harald Utne (Norway)

34. The main outcomes of the discussion are presented below grouped by topic.

Location of place of residence

35. The meeting accepted this as a core topic in the chapter on geographic characteristics. In the previous recommendations, this was covered in the chapter on population to be enumerated. During the discussion, it was clarified that the last sentence in para 27 of WP 7 was included to avoid situations where the link between the address point and the person or household record is broken or deleted after the census operation is over, e.g. for data protection reasons.

36. With regard to the footnote to para 27, some participants questioned whether information on such level of detail was appropriate for the census recommendations, and why two systems were mentioned in the footnote.

Locality

37. It was agreed to rephrase the first sentence in para. 36 as follows: "This classification could also be applied <u>to analyse</u> other relevant population bases…"

Urban and rural areas

38. UNECE reported that one of the outcomes of the workshop on censuses for countries in Eastern Europe and Central Asia on 22 September was to propose considering this as a core topic, based on the fact that this is a core topic in the global Principles and Recommendations for Population and Housing Censuses, and that the large majority of UNECE countries reported such information in the 2010 census round. The proposal was accepted.

39. Moreover, it was agreed to reverse the order in the categories of the classification in para. 41 (to be consistent with the classification of localities in para. 35), and correct a typo in category 5.0 (it should be 249,999 instead of 24,999).

Population grid

40. This was proposed as a separate new derived core topic. There was general agreement to have this as a separate topic, but there were different views as to whether it should be a core or non-core topic. Some countries, especially EEA countries, underlined

the importance of this topic for international comparisons, flexible data dissemination and spatial analyses. Other countries, especially in Eastern Europe, and CIS-Stat, proposed to consider it as a non-core topic, reporting problems in obtaining geographical coordinates in some remote rural areas, and concerns related to data confidentiality issues.

41. The task force leader and the UNECE secretariat suggested that this could be considered as a core topic, but modifying the text to specify that countries with specific conditions could decide not to consider the topic. In alternative, it should be considered as a non-core topic. The issue will be discussed by the UNECE Steering Group on Censuses.

Degree of urbanisation

42. This was accepted as a new derived non-core topic. However, it was agreed to reverse the order of the categories in the classifications in paras 49 and 51.

Location of place of work

43. The participants discussed the two alternative classifications presented. The less detailed classification (alternative 2) was preferred or as a further alternative, a more detailed classification at two digit level could be recommended as optional. It was also proposed not to include category 6.0 ('Location of place of work not determined'), as this would correspond to a 'not stated' category which is not included in any other topic.

Location of living quarters

44. UNECE informed the participants that the Task Force on Housing Characteristics proposed to move the topic "location of living quarters" from the chapter on housing to the chapter on geographic characteristics.

45. It was noted that if the topic is to be transferred, then the definition should be more in line with the definitions of Location of place of residence and Location of place of work, that is, it should be more specific concerning the detail of geography (smallest possible civil division and/or geographical coordinates). The meeting did not conclude on this issue and further discussion will be needed by the leader of the task force and the Steering Group.

Mode of transport to work

46. The revised classification for "mode of transport to work" was accepted. However, it was proposed to rename the category5.0 in "No journey made" (including the case of oil rigs, where workers live at the place of employment), and sub-divide it into 5.1 'Working at home' and 5.2 'No fixed place'.

E. Migration characteristics

Documentation: Papers submitted by Serbia (WP 19), Turkey (WP 20) and UNECE Task Force on Migration and ethno-cultural characteristics (WP 10).

Discussion leader: Jane Badets (Canada)

47. In the first part of the session, two presentations were given by Serbia and Turkey on migration statistics collected in the population census in these countries. The presenters were asked to clarify some issues covered in the presentations such as were there any geocoding of addresses done for immigrants and the possibility of micro-data analysis. Serbia was asked if there were any changes in the level of emigration patterns over time.

48. The discussion leader presented the main changes proposed to the CES Recommendations for the chapter on Migration Characteristics, noting the work that has been done by the Task Force on Migration and Ethno-cultural Characteristics to thoroughly review the chapter including consultation with migration experts and the Office of the

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). No changes are recommended to the list of core and non-core migration topics. The Task Force's main proposed changes to the chapter were:

(a) To clearly distinguish between international migration and internal migration concepts;

(b) To ensure a flow of concepts throughout the chapter so that "like" concepts are presented together, for example country of citizenship and acquisition of citizenship;

(c) To clarify population groups relevant to international migration;

(d) To provide guidance related to the reporting of dual or multiple citizenships, year of arrival and international border changes in cases of war or the dissolution of countries.

49. Some points of discussion were raised around distinguishing international migration as a new derived topic and its contribution to the existing derived topic in regard to persons with foreign/national background; and to regroup the international population groups definitions as: Foreign born (divided into the Foreign population and Nationals sub-groups) and Native born (divided into Foreign population and Nationals sub-groups).

50. For previous place of residence concepts, the current recommendations have only place of usual residence one year prior to the census as a core topic. There was a suggestion to also promote place of residence five years prior to the census from non-core to core topic. It was noted however that this would be a potential burden to collect both concepts as core. It was therefore agreed that the residence one year ago will remain core, and residence five years ago remain as a non-core topic, but countries could ask both concepts should this be needed to fulfil their information needs.

51. There was agreement that "mixed-parental background" should be included in Table 1, entitled Classification of population according to country of birth of parents, country of birth and citizenship, so as to distinguish those who are of mixed native and foreign-born parentage. As well, it was recommended that the headers of Table 1 should be "country of birth" rather than 'place of birth" given that the focus of the table is on country of birth concepts.

52. "Persons of mixed parental background" concepts will be re-labelled in the chapter to avoid confusion with ethnicity. The new label will be "persons whose parents are of a 'mixed country of birth' background".

53. It was mentioned that country or place of birth could be collected in two ways: according to actual residence or according to the mother's usual residence. This will be noted in the proposed recommendations.

54. Some countries noted that it would be difficult to collect detailed administrative levels for place of birth related to internal migrants (e.g. city or town of birth). It was agreed that place of birth for internal migrants should be collected at a higher level of geography such as for state or territory of birth.

55. In regard to the issue of how to report former countries, it was suggested to collect information on city of place/country of birth, and then code the response to current country boundaries.

F. Ethno-cultural characteristics

Documentation: Papers submitted by the United Kingdom (WP 21) and the UNECE Task Force on Migration and ethno-cultural characteristics (WP 10).

Discussion leader: Jane Badets (Canada)

56. The United Kingdom presented a paper on measuring ethno-cultural characteristics in the England and Wales Census. There was a discussion and questions asked on how to code and classify religious affiliation in a standardized way when there can be many different responses recorded in different countries. It was reported that both the United Kingdom and Australia use detailed religious classifications for their census information based on national circumstances and experience. These classifications could be used by other countries but the presenter noted that the CESR recommended the use of only a broad classification. Ireland asked if Gypsies and the Roma were separately distinguished in the UK ethnicity question.

57. The discussion leader presented the proposed changes to the Ethno-cultural Characteristics chapter based on the work of the Task Force. Overall, there were no major changes being proposed for this chapter. No new topics emerged, and all of the concepts presented in this chapter (ethnicity, religion and language) will remain as non-core topics. The major proposed changes were:

(a) Clarification of concepts where required, recognizing that the specific questions asked for each of the topics (ethnicity, religion and language) should be guided by the information needs of the users and the advice of key stakeholders;

(b) For ethnicity, it will be noted that self–declaration and mixed ethnicity may require multi-response options, and the possible bias that could arise from the wording of an ethnic question. Text was also added to recognize that information on indigenous populations may be collected in the ethnicity concept based on country context;

(c) For religion, text was added to explain the potential uses of collection of this information, as well as that special care should be taken to demonstrate to respondents that appropriate data protection and disclosure control measures are in place given that collecting information on religion might be sensitive for respondents;

(d) For language, clarification was provided around the different concepts that can be used to collect information on this topic, as well as to note the challenges in collecting information on multiple languages spoken, and that consideration should be given to provide instructions for those who are deaf-mute.

58. Albania asked whether there should be age limits for the reporting of religion. Several participants noted the difficulties in coming up with a specific age limit, and it was decided that this issue should be determined based on national circumstances. A mention to this effect will be made to the proposed chapter text.

59. Several countries noted the challenge of collecting detailed information on ethnicity and languages, especially when there are no internationally recognized standards for the classification of ethnic groups and languages. Both Russia and Canada noted they collect and publish detailed information for these concepts, despite there not being international standards. UNSD noted that there is an international classification for languages, but it is not statistically approved. The discussion leader noted that a link (or reference) to this classification will be provided in the final proposed chapter so that countries can refer to it when collecting detailed languages.

G. Operational aspects of censuses

Documentation: Papers submitted by Spain (WP 22), Russia (WP 23), IPUMS-International (WP 27), and the UNECE Steering Group on Censuses (WP 5, WP 14).

Discussion leader: Ian White (United Kingdom)

60. In the first part of the session, the representatives of Spain, Russia and IPUMS International presented their papers.

61. Responding to questions from the participants, the Spanish representative clarified that the issue of confidentiality was dealt with by limiting the topics and the detail of the information available when the geographical area defined was too small. On other issues, he added that the system is fast because it uses OLAP (online analytical processing) with pre-aggregated tables for the more common queries, and that there is limited information about user experiences with the Spanish dissemination system, however some users objected to moving to a sample-based system from a traditional method.

62. The representative of the Russian Federation clarified that their system uses microdata, which users can aggregate according to their query. Data can be aggregated quickly, and crosstabulations of the variables are possible. An algorithm protects the confidentiality of the data.

63. With regard to the presentation by IPUMS, it was clarified that data are presented for areas with a population of at least 20’000 inhabitants. If necessary, aggregated data are presented.

64. The session covered those operational topics that were new or where the 2010 CES Recommendations had been revised or expanded, in particular: Fundamental principles of official statistics; Legal basis for the census; Communications; Publicity campaign; Dissemination; Documentation and metadata; Archiving; Costs and benefits. The main comments from participants are reported below.

65. CIS-Stat questioned why persons with high incomes and young men had been specifically identified as target groups at para 39, and noted several other groups (including all migrants, not only illegal migrants) to which reference might similarly be made. In response, the discussant noted that the target audience for a census was effectively everybody, and that those groups had only been identified as examples where particular circumstances may exist. UNECE suggested softening the language of para 39 to say “Groups of specific concern… may include: …”

66. CIS-Stat proposed that reference to census coverage surveys should be included in the publicity section (at para 54), but the discussant took the view that such voluntary follow-up surveys were more related to quality and coverage issues, and reference to such surveys would be made in the section of the recommendations on quality. However, a reference could be added in the recommendations to the difficulty of publicising activities such as census tests, pilots and post-enumeration surveys which will apply to only a very small proportion of the population, and where publicity might create more confusion than cast light.

67. CIS-Stat also questioned the value of specifically recommending SMS texting as a publicity media at para 45(j), and commented that SMS texting can be an intrusive method of outreach. Others also advised against referring to specific technologies and media in carrying out the census as these were likely to be subject to change over the decade. The case of specific social media such as Facebook and Twitter was cited. The discussant took the view that it was expected the recommendations would have to be acted on within the next few years when such technologies were very likely still to be in use. However, the recommendations could refer more in general to social networking and video services.

68. There were also concerns expressed about the accuracy of the Russian translation. The translation of the terms “persons with high incomes” in para. 39 and “young men” in para. 47 (the Russian term used makes the gender unclear) should be revised.

69. It was suggested to add a reference to “"data sources” as an additional key element of metadata at para 72. The discussion leader agreed, and noted the requirement to refer to

data sources in the standard metadata for the EU census hub. On the same subject, it was noted that there should also be reference to quality indicators as a key element of metadata.

70. Reference to the importance of budgeting for contingencies at the start of the budgeting process was also stressed for inclusion in the section on costs and benefits.

71. It was suggested replacing the term "businessmen" at para 39(c) with "business people", and mention the importance of local partnerships for quality checking purposes. The discussant agreed that these were valid points.

H. Demographic characteristics

Documentation: Paper submitted by the UNECE Task Force on Demographic, Household and Family Characteristics (WP 11).

Discussion leader: Arona Pistiner (United States)

72. The discussion leader reminded that for demographic characteristics there was very high compliance with the 2010 recommendations, and that only few changes were proposed for the 2020 recommendations, concerning in particular:

(a) Legal marital status: Proposed inclusion of same-sex legal partnerships, for countries where this is relevant.

(b) Proposed making de facto marital status a core-topic (in 2010 it was a non-core topic) and clarifying the classification.

(c) Some members of the task force proposed to add a new cross-classification of legal and de facto marital status, whereas others did not agree.

73. The discussion focused on the following topics.

74. Indeterminate sex or third sex – UNESCO indicated that there are a few countries (including Germany) adding a third category to sex: male, female, and indeterminate sex. Some participants noted that this group is so small that - due to disclosure guidelines – such data could not be published. Moreover, in some countries where the concept is not recognized there could be negative reaction. UNECE suggested, instead, noting in the recommendations that the third sex could be reflected in the countries where it is legally allowed. The Steering Group will consider this issue.

75. Concerning the categories for the topic "de facto marital status" (para 18), Slovakia proposed to split the first category 1.0 "Person living with spouse or partner (registered or in consensual union) having usual residence in the same household" in two categories, distinguishing those living with the spouse and those living with a cohabiting partner. According to Slovakia, this would allow producing separate data on marriages and cohabitations which could be used for analysis of family behavior and for population and family policies.

76. Slovakia also supported the inclusion of the new cross-classification between legal and de facto marital status (para. 23). However, there was limited support for the proposal. Most of the participants were not in favour of adding the new cross-classification, and noted that it would be better to keep separate the two topics, legal and de facto marital status. It was agreed not to include the new cross-classification in the chapter.

77. With regard to the proposal to make de facto marital status a core topic, there were mixed views. Latvia was concerned about the additional expense and work necessary to include the topics in the census, if it was to be a core topic. Some countries were concerned by increasing the number of core topics in general, and by whether or not register-based censuses would be able to provide data for this topic. Other countries supported the

proposal to consider this topic as core, noting that it reflects actual living arrangements that are more relevant than legal marital status, and that most countries (with different census methodologies) already collect this information. Norway and Czech Republic noted that data for this topic can be produced using register data, and it would be derived anyway in order to produce data on household status.

78. UNSD mentioned that in the Principles and Recommendations the legal marital status is one of the most important topics, as it helps determine services provided by a country. However, also de facto aspects are given increasing attention and could be expanded. Since it was not possible to take a decision, it was agreed that the Steering Group and the task force leader would need to take a decision on the proposal, taking into account the comments made at the meeting.

79. Luxemburg asked for a review of the classification of legal marital status (paragraph 13) stating that it is not complete and will not identify those persons separated, divorced, or widowed, resulting from a legal partnership.

80. With regard to the topic "number of children born alive", Ireland proposed that the recommendation should suggest that countries may also with to collect (and separately identify) information on stillbirths. The Steering Group will consider this proposal and others made at the meeting on which a decision was not taken.

I. Household and family characteristics

Documentation: Paper submitted by the UNECE Task Force on Demographic, Household and Family Characteristics (WP 12).

Discussion leader: Arona Pistiner (United States)

81. The discussion leader reminded that for household and family characteristics there was very high compliance with the 2010 recommendations, and that only few changes were proposed for the 2020 recommendations, concerning in particular:

(a) Clarify the concept of "Homelessness", using the terms rooflessness and rootlessness.

(b) Revise Household relationship to include "registered partner" and drop "domestic servant" as a separate category.

(c) Explicit inclusion of same-sex marriage in Household Status (optional for countries where it is relevant).

(d) Expanded questions on Internet Access.

82. The discussion focused on a number of topics, as summarized below.

83. Concerning homelessness, in general the two concepts roofless and (in particular) rootlessness were not well received. It was noted that the two terms are not clear, and there is overlap between the two concepts. Several countries suggested changing the terms and the definitions. The representative of FEANTSA (the European Federation of National Organisations working with the Homeless) suggested using the European Typology on Homelessness and Housing Exclusion (ETHOS), or at least the first two categories: rooflessness and houselessness.

84. UNSD indicated that for the Principles and Recommendations, the same classification used in the 2020 recommendations (primary and secondary homelessness) was used. UNECE suggested going back to the classification used in the 2010 recommendations, which is also used for the Principles and Recommendations. The issue will be discussed by the Steering Group and the task force leader.

85. It was proposed that a list of types of homeless establishments could be added to para 13. For many countries, the census is not the primary source of data on the homeless. The issue is really how to collect the data. More work needs to be done on this topic.

86. The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights suggested replacing "perceived" with "implemented" in para. 12, since there is an internationally agreed definition of "adequate housing".

87. Latvia proposed that the classification of household status (para. 42) be considered optional at the 3rd digit level. However, the 3rd level includes lone parent households, which is considered an important category.

88. UNESCO proposed wording category 2.0 at para 73 as "One adult at or over legal retirement age".

89. Concerning Internet access (para 96) it was noted that the list of possible internet connections will soon be outdated. Public access is not listed. Eurostat proposed reverting to the 2010 recommendation classification. This issue will be discussed by the Steering Group.

J. Housing characteristics

Documentation: Papers submitted by the Czech Republic (WP 24), and the UNECE Task Force on Housing (WP 13); additional papers (not discussed) submitted by FEANTSA.

Discussion leader: Adelheid Bauer (Austria)

90. The session started with a presentation of a paper by the Czech Republic, on the processing of the 2011 census data and in particular on the procedures adopted to link persons with dwellings and buildings.

91. Then, the discussion leader presented the main changes between the old CES recommendations and the new draft text proposed for the 2020 recommendations. The topics bathing facilities, toilet facilities, and water supply are considered core topics, but it is acknowledged that countries where all (or almost all) dwellings are equipped may not need to include the topics in their censuses.

92. UNECE noted that in the classification for piped gas (para. 101) a new category could be added for "both heating and cocking purposes", and that the classification of dwellings by period of construction of the building (para 119) should be updated to accommodate the period since 2011.

93. Concerning chart 1, Latvia noted that the definition in footnote 1 is very important and should be highlighted in the main text. Latvia also noted that footnote 2 in Chart 1 is unclear. It was clarified that the definitions are broadly given in chapter 2 "Definitions".

94. Concerning chart 2, United Kingdom suggested removing the "homeless" column, and modifying the order of the topics be consistent with the text. The discussion leader agreed.

95. For type of living quarters (para. 28), United Kingdom suggested to add a new category for "Other collective living quarters" as a residual category, and to recognize multi-household living quarters. It was also proposed to retain the text of the old para. 594 of the CES Recommendations for the 2010 round, and modify it to inform the reader of the difference with the definition of living quarters in the global Principles and Recommendations, which includes seasonal, secondary and vacant dwellings.

96. With regard to occupancy status (para 38), United Kingdom observed that dwellings in buildings which are due for demolition should not be counted as belonging to the housing stock, because they are not available as living quarters.

97. Concerning bathing facilities (para 79), Estonia, supported by Finland, suggested including "sauna" as a category.

98. Concerning dwellings by number of floors in the building (para. 124) it was questioned whether it is necessary to count the number of floors from the ground upwards. It was also suggested to specify that it is a classification of dwellings by number of floors of the building.

99 The proposals on which there was no agreement at the meeting will be considered and discussed between the members of the Steering Group and the leader of the Task Force.

K. Economic characteristics

Documentation: Paper submitted by ILO (WP 8).

Discussion leader: Elisa Benes (ILO)

100. The discussion leader presented the main changes proposed to the CES Recommendations, reflecting in most cases the "Resolution concerning statistics of work, employment and labour underutilization" adopted at the 19th International Conference of Labour Statisticians (2013). The main issues raised in the discussion that followed are summarized below.

101. There was general appreciation by the participants for the revised chapter, and recognition that the new framework will provide greater coherence with the System of National Accounts and other economic statistics. However, some participants noted that a census is not a labour force survey and that the range of information collected can thus never be the same.

102. With regard to the proposal to consider "participation in own-use production of goods" as a core topic, representatives from several developed countries noted that the topic is not relevant in their countries, and requested that the topic be considered non-core. On the other hand, CIS-Stat and some countries of Eastern Europe and Central Asia stressed the relevance of measuring participation in own-use production of goods to adequately describe their economies. ILO recommended that the topic be considered as core (and included in the census) only in the countries where it is relevant to describe the economic characteristics of the population. In this case, guidance would be needed to determine when the topic should be considered as core. It was also suggested to possibly restrict measurement of persons in own-use production of goods, only when not in employment, to reduce possible burden. Some countries were against the inclusion in the recommendations of "core" topics on optional basis (only for countries where they are relevant), noting that this practice would undermine the importance of core topics in general. The Steering Group will review the issue and try to formulate a compromise solution.

103. Concern was also expressed about potential differences between the labour force status classification of the population, and the main activity classification based on self-declaration being discussed by Eurostat. ILO commented that the labour force status classification is well established as the core classification in labour market statistics. Further discussion will be needed with Eurostat to ensure that the differences between these two classifications are made clear.

104. Some participants expressed concern about the introduction of a minimum age limit for the classification of persons outside the labour force. It was agreed that this issue should be addressed in the text.

105. Countries were consulted regarding possible interest in reintroducing the sub-classification of unemployed persons to identify first time job seekers. The majority of participants indicated, however, that they would not be collecting such information in the population census.

106. Countries were also consulted regarding the inclusion of additional text on the optional measurement of other forms of work, in particular, volunteer work, own-use provision of services, unpaid trainee work. No clear interest was expressed in this suggestion.

L. Agriculture

Documentation: Paper submitted by the UNECE Steering Group on Censuses (WP 9).

Discussion leader: Jairo Castano (FAO)

107. The discussion leader presented the draft recommendations on agriculture for the 2020 round. He highlighted amendments made in paragraphs 33 (concerning the FAO World Programme on the Census of Agriculture 2020); 35 and 41 (ISIC Rev. 4); 37 (agricultural holder); 38 (agricultural activities and ILO's new conceptual framework for work statistics); and 39 and 40 (own-use production of agricultural/aquacultural goods). The amendments were accepted unanimously.

108. UNECE informed that the text on the relation between population census and agricultural census that was presented in the CES Recommendations for the 2010 round (Part 1, section VI) would be revised, shortened and moved to the chapter on agriculture. A proposal will be sent to FAO. It was recommended that this introductory text should be consistent with UNSD's Principles and recommendations for population and housing census. There were no other comments and the proposal was accepted.

M. Educational characteristics

Documentation: Paper submitted by the UNECE Task Force on Economic and Educational Characteristics (WP 9).

Discussion leader: Friedrich Huebler (UNESCO)

109. The discussion leader presented the proposal on educational characteristics by the Task Force on Economic and Educational Characteristics and UNESCO, and drew attention to the two following issues related to the text on school attendance:

(a) Some changes to the text in para. 23 were proposed to reflect new definitions related to labour force status in the chapter on economic characteristics.

(b) A new paragraph was proposed for inclusion after para. 23, with the ISCED-P levels for classification of programmes.

110. There were no objections and the amendments proposed were accepted.

111. With regard to the educational attainment topic, it was noted that the collection and coding of data on qualifications is a challenging task because of the large number and diversity of qualifications, including those acquired abroad. The discussion leader explained that UNESCO had no tools or database (except ISCED mappings) to aid

countries in the coding of qualifications but noted that researchers in Germany have attempted to build an international database on qualifications that could help data collecting agencies and analysts match foreign qualifications with those that are equivalent in the national system.

N. Quality management

Documentation: Paper submitted by United Kingdom (WP 26), and the UNECE Task Force on Census Quality (WP 6).

Discussion leader: Garnett Compton (United Kingdom)

112. The session opened with a presentation by United Kingdom on mode effects between paper and internet responses in the 2011 Census in England and Wales. The main conclusions from the paper were that:

(a) Minimisation of mode effects between paper and internet is partially achieved. The biggest impact is likely to be the over-use of internet responders as donors during edit and imputation processing.

(b) The main driver for differences in the modes and the agreement rates in the Census quality survey were the characteristics of responders in the two channels.

(c) The move to a primarily internet data collection operation in 2021 will mean different thinking about mode effects and how to minimise this in the design.

113. Among the comments from the meeting, Canada shared that their analysis of modal bias was very similar and found any differences mostly driven by the characteristics of responders. In addition, thinking ahead to 2016 (their next census) and an internet first approach they are concerned about modal bias and the ability to design a good questionnaire that can be used across all devices, with particular concerns about smaller devices such as smart phones.

114. The session then focused on the new chapter of the CES Recommendations on quality management and the main changes since the last meeting. The key changes from the 2010 recommendations were:

(a) A new chapter on quality management will give the topic more prominence. This incorporates a new section outlining a quality management framework for managing the six dimensions of quality through the full life cycle of the census. The main components of the quality management framework include: Setting quality targets, Quality design, Operational quality control, Quality improvement, and Quality evaluation and reporting .

(b) The chapter includes a new recommendation that a national total population estimate, adjusted in the light of quality assurance and evaluation activities, should be published – see para 29.

(c) Appendices IV and V were merged to one Appendix ‘Quality Management Programme Implementation’.

115. Given the minimal changes to the proposed chapter since the 2013 meeting it was recommended that the chapter as drafted be endorsed by the meeting. There were no further comments on the topic or paper so the chapter was endorsed.

O. Disability

Documentation: Paper submitted by the UNECE Steering Group on Population Censuses (WP 11).

Discussion leader: Mitch Loeb (United States)

116. The discussion leader presented briefly the proposed text on disability, that was prepared by the UNECE Steering Group on Population Censuses in collaboration with the UN sponsored Washington Group on Disability Statistics. Minimal changes were introduced to the draft text that was already discussed in 2013.

117. In the discussion that followed, Canada asked whether mental and emotional conditions could be measured in the census. The discussion leader mentioned that each of the six disability questions is designed to capture one domain of functioning at a time in a straightforward way. While mental and emotional functioning are not specifically included among the six domains of functioning, many people with these two types of difficulties also have concomitant difficulties in some of the six dimensions covered in the proposed recommendations. More detailed data collection on mental and emotional functioning would require a more complex approach. An extended set of questions – also including mental and emotional difficulties – has been developed by the Washington Group for use in surveys.

118. Albania asked if the recommended questions were suitable for small children. The discussion leader acknowledged that the questions on seeing and hearing are suitable for all ages, and the remaining domains (walking, cognition, self-care and communication) are suited for the population 5 years of age and older. The Washington Group, in collaboration with UNICEF, is currently finalizing a separate survey module on child functioning and disability for the population 2 through 17 years of age.

119. It was suggested to recall in the recommendations that due to the sensitivity of disability questions (and in particular the use of the word ‘disability’ itself), the way the question is presented may affect the results. In particular, the results are influenced by the survey technique (interview or self-compilation).

120. UNSD reported that for the global Principles and Recommendations a shorter version of the text on disability will be considered. It was noted that there was no problem with having a longer text in the CES Recommendations as long as there is general consistency with the shorter text in the global recommendations.

121. It was suggested that the recommendations should make reference to the fundamental rights of disabled persons and related recommendations to produce relevant statistics for monitoring.