

**Economic and Social Council**Distr.: General
20 August 2012

Original: English

Economic Commission for Europe

Conference of European Statisticians

Group of Experts on Population and Housing Censuses**Fifteenth Meeting**

Geneva, 30 September – 3 October 2013

Item 4 of the provisional agenda

Population bases**Some proposals for the Revision of the CES
Recommendations on the population to be enumerated****Note by the UNECE Task Force on population to be enumerated and
geographic characteristics****Summary*

Building upon the experience of the UNECE countries during their latest census, this document proposes various new paragraphs as well as amendments to the Conference of European Statisticians (CES) Recommendations on population and housing censuses as for what concerns the core pillar of a census: the definition of population and its implementation. In general, this paper aims to clarify the theoretical framework related to the 'usually resident population' concept. Definitions about fundamental concepts such as population basis and enumeration, or clarifications about the inclusion/exclusion in the usually resident population of categories of persons particularly difficult to classify are here proposed; however, attention is given also to alternative population bases which may meet peculiar national needs. The paper intends to pave the way toward definitions of population fully comparable across countries.

* This document has been prepared by Giampaolo Lanzieri of the Statistical Office of the European Union (Eurostat). Comments by Ian White (ONS), Snezana Lakcevic (Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia) and Harald Utne (Statistics Norway) are gratefully acknowledged.

I. Introduction

1. For the sake of keeping the pace with the census methodological developments and – more generally – with the socio-economic evolutions of the contemporary societies, after every population census round it is common practice to revise the international recommendations which were applied by then.
2. In cooperation with the statistical offices of Europe, North America, Central and Western Asia, the UNECE has undertaken this action also for the latest censuses round. Preliminary information about national practices has been collected by means of a survey of 51 countries of the UNECE region, whose results have been analysed by various task forces.
3. The outcomes of this exercise will lead to proposals of revisions of the Conference of European Statisticians Recommendations (hereinafter CES Recommendations), published in 2006 (UNECE 2006), which were the international recommendations of reference during the 2010 round of censuses for the countries of the UNECE region.
4. As for the population to be enumerated, the analysis carried out in Task Force on population to be enumerated and geographic characteristics (2013) has shown that some population concepts used in the CES Recommendations would benefit from further clarifications. Basically, this paper aims simply to provide a basis for discussions in this regard. The focus is here in amendments to the approach currently applied in the international recommendations. However, it should be noted that further proposals, not necessarily following the current practice, may be formulated at a later stage.
5. In the following, the reader is assumed to be familiar with the outcomes reported in Task Force on Population to be enumerated and geographic characteristics (2013) as well as with the chapter 3 of the CES Recommendations (paragraphs from 157 to 179). The original recommendations are reported in italics, while the proposals for revision are in **bold italics**. A synoptic view of the current version of the CES Recommendations and the corresponding proposed amendments is in the Annex to this document (ECE/CES/GE.41/2013/11/Add.1).

II. Proposals of new definitions and amendments

6. The definitions are here given only with reference to persons. The presentation of the proposals follows a defined structure, which starts from the definition of basic concepts, then moves to the identification of criteria and continues with the proposed definitions of populations. At this point, problematic cases are dealt with, concerning both the uncertainty of the inclusion of particular population sub-groups, as well as the correct geographical allocation within a country for uncertain cases. The Annex in ECE/CES/GE.41/2013/11/Add.1 compares the current CES Recommendations with the specific proposed amendments, following the structure of the UNECE publication.

A. On enumeration and population

7. Considering the methodological and technological developments taking place in the population censuses, the data collection linked to a questionnaire, possibly by means of a direct interview, let's say - the most traditional form of census operation – is gradually losing importance. Moreover, the supposed perfect overlapping between the enumerated persons and the population of a country is also misleading, because various concepts of population may actually be defined. These conceptual differences should therefore be reflected in the new version of the CES Recommendations.

8. The following two definitions are proposed to clarify the meaning of two concepts fundamental for a census exercise.

New paragraph 01: *“In the context of census exercises, ‘enumeration’ means the act of collecting data about a person, irrespective of whether this occurs with the direct participation of that person.”*;

New paragraph 02: *“In the context of census exercises, ‘population’ is a set of persons attributed to a geographic entity who meet defined criteria at the census reference time. These criteria should help to identify qualifying adjectives (labels) which clarify which population is being referred to.”*

The definition New paragraph 01 above aims to include the case in which the data collection is carried out from registers, and where, therefore, there is no enumeration in the traditional sense of a direct transfer of information from the respondent. The first part clarifies that the definition are here given with reference to population censuses, and that different definitions may obviously apply in different contexts. The second definition above gives only a broad qualification to the concept of population. In fact, it defines a population in space and time. While the need of the latter is self-evident, the former, qualified by ‘*attributed to a geographic entity*’, may possibly be dropped, but it is here given for sake of completeness. It will be shown below that an ‘entity’ does not necessarily refers to an existing geographic place.

9. The comparability of census data across countries should be already evident from the label attributed to the population whose results are being analyzed. The following paragraph is therefore proposed to encourage countries to use an internationally consistent terminology:

New paragraph 03: *“To meet national purposes, a country may have an interest in various populations. It is recommended that the qualifying adjectives (labels) attributed to the national populations are as close as possible to the meaning given in the international context.”*

10. A few further definitions are also necessary to clarify the differences between operational concepts:

New paragraph 04: *“In the context of a census exercise, a country may wish to enumerate all persons present in their territory and/or supposedly belonging to the population of interest. ‘Population to be enumerated’ is the group of persons who the country decides should be covered by the census, regardless of their later inclusion in a population count, as defined below. The ‘enumerated population’ is composed of those persons who have actually been enumerated. This is different from the census coverage, as there is no reference here to a defined population of interest.”*

New paragraph 05: *“Population count’ or ‘population base’ is the population used for the compilation of aggregates for statistical purposes. This may be a subset from or the whole of the enumerated population. A country may have one or more population bases, all derived from the enumerated population, among which should always be included the population base used for international comparisons purposes.”*

B. Place of usual residence

11. The fundamental concept to define the allocation of a person to one or another country, and to the proper geographic place within the country, is the residence. However, this concept is particularly difficult to make it operational, and the international practice has used a qualification to bypass large conceptual difficulties, recurring to the adjective ‘usual’. Further, international recommendations have linked that to the concept of ‘place’,

which makes the distinction between ‘residence’ as a condition of the person and ‘place of residence’ as a geographic reference of that condition.

12. Two approaches may be taken in defining the place of usual residence. The first makes reference only to the main criterion qualifying a place as the usual residence; the second makes the concept clearer by specifying the time frame. These two approaches are represented in the following two options:

(a) New paragraph 06A: *“Place of usual residence is the geographic place where the enumerated person usually spends the daily rest, assessed over a defined period of time including the census reference time.”*

(b) New paragraph 06B: *“Place of usual residence is the geographic place where the enumerated person usually spends the daily rest, assessed over a continuous (past and/or future) period of time of at least 12 months, including the census reference time.”*

The first option so formulated can actually be used to define various concepts of population. By the latter definition, the place of usual residence cannot be considered without reference to a one-year period, whose frame includes the census reference time and regardless whether that period includes the past, or is projected into the future (the so-called ‘intention of stay’), or covers both.

13. It is however necessary to add clarification to the qualifying adjective ‘continuous’. The following paragraph is thus proposed to be added to the New paragraph 06B:

New paragraph 06B (cont.): *“A ‘continuous period of time’ means that absences (from the place of usual residence) whose durations are shorter than 12 months do not affect the place of usual residence.”*

No reference is made here to the reason of the temporary absence: only the time duration is relevant. It should be noted that its application may give rise to different conclusions in the interpretation of the criterion of ‘most of the time’. For instance, persons in military service for a period of 9 months do not change their place of usual residence so defined, whereas they would do so by applying the criterion of ‘most of the time’, which, in effect, sets a threshold of six months in the selected time frame of any one year.

14. In fact, the duration of the absence can be seen from a different point of view. If we focus the attention on a single 12-month period, in the example of the person in military service we could actually say that the place of usually residence is where (s)he has been stationed, while the residual period of 3 months spent at the home place actually defines a temporary place of residence. The choice of the home place instead of the military service place is in fact due to a perspective larger than a single one-year period. The definition of ‘continuous time’ makes reference to a period of at least 12 months, but implicitly that period may be longer. Therefore, whereas when using the ‘continuous time’ criterion the attention is on a longer period of time, in the ‘most-of-the-time’ approach the focus is on a precise time frame of one year. It is simply matter of discretionary choice whether to adopt one or the other.

C. Usually resident population and additional definitions of population

15. The population concept currently acknowledged to be the definition of reference is the ‘usually resident population’. In the CES Recommendations, this definition is somehow diluted in a set of paragraphs (paragraphs 159, 160, 171 and 172), where it is sometimes mixed with problematic cases.

16. The definition of place of usual residence given at 12(a) above can actually be used to define various concepts of population, while the second option accommodates all the additional specifications already in the definition of place of usual residence, leaving less ambiguity. The corresponding definitions of ‘usually resident population’ would then be:

(a) New paragraph 07A: ***“The usually resident population of a country is composed of those persons who have the place of usual residence in the country at the census reference time and have lived or intend to live there for a continuous period of time of at least 12 months. A ‘continuous period of time’ means that absences (from the place of usual residence) whose durations are shorter than 12 months do not affect the place of usual residence. The same criteria apply for any relevant territorial division of the country.”***

(b) New paragraph 07B: ***“The usually resident population of a country is composed of those persons who have the place of usual residence in the country at the census reference time. The same criterion applies for any relevant territorial division of the country.”***

The difference between the two options above is in the additional criteria that need to be added now to the option A, whilst for the option B this is not necessary because already taken into account in the corresponding definition of place of usual residence.

17. Several other so-called usually resident populations could be defined by relaxing one or the other criterion. For instance, dropping the intention of stay, or adopting a threshold of 6 months, or using the criterion of ‘most of the time’, but generally keeping as an essential point the fact that the person spends in that given place the daily rest. However, these are approximations to the concept of usually resident population, which is here defined by the combination of three identifying elements: having lived in the territory of the country and/or the intention of stay there, a continuous period of time and a time threshold of 12 months. Any other criterion would produce (perhaps slightly, but still) different population figures. In simple words, the alternative populations obtained by relaxing one or more identifying factors constitute a ‘family of populations’ based on the concept of place of usual residence. Again, it is matter of discretionary choice which one is taken as the ‘true’ usually resident population.

18. It is useful at this point to clarify the role of the usually resident population – however defined – in the international context, which is done by the following new paragraph:

New paragraph 08: ***“The population base to be used for international comparisons purposes is the ‘usually resident population’. If a country cannot adopt as population base the ‘usually resident population’, it should put all possible efforts to get an estimate as close to it as possible using its own population base(s), meeting at least some of the criteria for usual residence.”***

19. The first sentence in New paragraph 08 above is linked to the definition of population bases, given in Section II-A. It is a fundamental statement which specifies the main population concept that is conventionally considered as the one that is internationally comparable. However, it cannot be excluded that future discussions, as well as methodological developments, may lead to the adoption of a different concept for international comparisons purposes. At that point, it would be simple to adapt this sentence accordingly. This particular proposal merely reflects the current international recommendations.

20. The second sentence in New paragraph 08 above aims to ensure as much comparability as possible across countries, given the constraints resulting from census national practices and methodologies. For instance, an estimate of the usually resident

population could be obtained from the registered population (see below for a proposed definition), selecting those persons who are assumed to be living in the country, where the time threshold is set on 12 months and possibly covering the intention of stay (e.g., by assuming that the duration of a visa/residence permit correspond to the actual stay). The residual difference would then be in the definition of the place of residence, which in the usual residence approach is the place where the person spends the daily rest, while for the registered population is (are) the place(s) declared to the authorities, the two not necessarily overlapping. However, emphasis must be given to the fact that the two populations are conceptually different.

21. Several population concepts other than the 'usually resident' can be defined. In general, it may be useful to distinguish the issue of the attribution of a person to a single country from his/her geographical allocation within the country. Given the one-to-one relation between place of usual residence and usually resident population, the geographical allocation is straightforward for the usually resident population (although with some exceptions), while it may not be the same in other cases. Additional population definitions are here given as examples, without any pretention to represent an exhaustive list:

New paragraph 09: *“The following are examples of definition of additional population bases that could be used for national purposes:*

(a) *The ‘present population’ of a country (also called ‘de facto’ population) is composed by those persons who are found in the territory of the country at the enumeration. When the enumeration takes place over a period of time and cannot cover those who have left since the census reference time, this population may be different from to the population present at the census reference time. The ‘de facto’ population should be clearly referred either to a moment in time or to a period of time.*

(b) *The ‘registered population’ of a country is composed of those persons who are listed on one or more registers owned by national authorities at the census reference time. Each registered person shall be counted only once. Persons belonging to the registered population of a country may not necessarily be living in the territory of the country at the time of the census.*

(c) *The ‘national population’ of a country is composed of those persons holding the national citizenship (national citizens) at the census reference time. Persons belonging to the national population of a country may not necessarily be living in the territory of the country at the time of the census.*

(d) *The ‘legal population’ of a country (also called ‘de jure’ population) is composed of those persons who are entitled to be settled in the same country at the census reference time, either by holding the national citizenship or by any other authorization issued by national authorities. Persons belonging to the legal population of a country may not necessarily be living in the territory of the country at the time of the census.*

(e) Option A: *The ‘working population’ of a country is composed of those persons who are present on the territory of the country for work reasons during the census reference period. Persons belonging to the working population of a country may not necessarily have the place of usual residence in the territory of the country at the time of the census.*

Option B: *The ‘working population’ of a country is composed of those persons whose working place is in the territory of the country at the census reference time. The definition of working place follows the international recommendations on labour statistics. Persons belonging to the working population of a country may not have the place of usual residence in the territory of the country at the time of the census.*

Option C: *The ‘working population’ of a country is composed of those usually resident persons whose working place is in the territory of the country at the census reference time. The definition of working place follows the international recommendations on labour statistics.*

(f) Option A: *The ‘day-time population’ of a country is composed of those persons who are present at diurnal hours in the territory of the country during the census reference period, whatever the reason (work, study, leisure, etc.). Persons belonging to the day-time population of a country may not have the place of usual residence in the territory of the country at the time of the census.*

Option B: *The ‘day-time population’ of a country is composed of those usually resident persons who are present at diurnal hours in the territory of the country during the census reference period, whatever the reason (work, study, leisure, etc.).”*

22. For the ‘working population’ and the ‘day-time’ populations are also proposed alternative definitions (respectively option C and option B) which consider those bases as sub-sets of the usually resident population.

23. Apart the two options referring to usually resident persons, the additional definitions of population given above do not link the membership to a place of residence. This is due to the difficulty of defining the concept of ‘residence’, which requires further thoughts. However, these populations can be further refined by adding identifying criteria such as the permanence in the country for a given period of time, etc. These additional criteria should then be properly reflected in the label of the population. For instance, a ‘registered resident population’ may be composed of those persons who are registered and resident (with a clear definition of residence), and so on.

24. Given the variety of populations that can be adopted in the census, it is considered appropriate to provide a basic definition in the new recommendations, although this may be considered as a pivot around which ‘*families of populations*’ can actually be developed. It goes without saying that preference must always be given to a single population concept for international comparison purposes.

25. A difficulty peculiar to the legal population is that bilateral or international agreements between countries may allow the settlement of foreign persons without the issuance of a formal permit. Although the reference to the settlement is meant to exclude temporary moves resulting, for example, from tourism, if left to the sole principle of ‘right to stay’ the ‘potential’ population could be rather large, as might be the case, for instance for Member States of the European Union: it is therefore recommended to add a criterion based on some defined duration of stay. To avoid such virtual explosion of the population size, reference is also made in the definition to the national authorities, to highlight that any permission of stay as from international agreement or any extra-national source needs anyway to be ‘validated’ by local authorities. For instance, an asylum seeker is not part of the legal population until his/her application has been accepted by the national authorities; an EU citizen settling in another EU Member State can be required to apply for registration (whose acceptance by the local authorities is possibly depending upon his/her working, financial and/or social security situation), which would thus be the administrative act allowing the inclusion in the legal population; etc.

D. Implementation of the concept of usually resident population: inclusion/exclusion of selected population groups

26. In addition to the definitions of populations, it is proposed to clarify those problematic cases where there may be uncertainty as to whether or not they should be

included in the usually resident population, and, if included, where within the country they should be considered to be usually resident.

27. First of all, a clarification should be given how to classify persons who do not have a place of usual residence as defined above, such as nomads, vagrants, etc. Formally, these persons are not included in any usually resident population and their inclusion is actually a matter of discretionary choice. If this is the agreed approach, then the following guidelines could apply:

New paragraph 10: ***“Persons to whom the concept of usual residence does not apply, such as nomads and vagrants, are included in the usually resident population of the (geographic place of the) country where they are directly or indirectly found at the moment of the enumeration, irrespective of whether they meet the 12-month criterion. These persons should not be confused with persons whose usual residence is in another country. “***

28. It should be noted that the enumeration takes usually place at a moment after the census reference time, and by definition persons with no concept of usual residence are difficult to reach. The qualification of ‘directly or indirectly’ refers to the fact that sometimes data about these persons are estimated or obtained from sources other than the person him/herself. The reference to the non-application of the concept of usual residence is meant to prevent the classification in this sub-group of persons for whom it is simply difficult, but not impossible, to identify the proper place of usual residence.

29. Homeless persons are a borderline case: for some of them, the place of usual residence does actually exist, although not necessarily in a living quarter; for others, the continuous change of place where they spend the daily rest makes them similar to the other categories explicitly mentioned in New paragraph 10 (nomads and vagrants). Whatever their situation, the definition in New paragraph 10 ensures their inclusion in the usually resident population.

30. As for the duration of the presence, a person may not have a place of usual residence, but has been living in the country for a continuous period of 12 months. The inconvenience here is that it is not possible to identify the geographic place of usual residence if not by aggregation of the territorial division of interest. Intuitively, a person who has been wandering within the country for more than one year belongs to the usually resident population of the country, but the geographic place of usual residence cannot be formally identified at the level of the smallest territorial division. The New paragraph 10 allocates those persons to one specific place in the country.

31. A further cause of uncertainty concerns the inclusion in the population of the country when those persons have not been living in that country for at least 12 months. In principle, again they should not be part of the usually resident population, but if they are excluded from the census counting in the country where they are, they may not be enumerated anywhere else, in which case they would disappear, statistically, at international level. Although this may cause a double counting in different countries carrying out their census at different times, it may be considered preferable to run this risk rather than neglect a portion of the population.

32. A number of population sub-groups who should be included/excluded are already described in the CES Recommendations paragraphs 173-175. For the purpose of making clear the difference between inclusion/exclusion and allocation within a given country, a rearrangement of the categories of persons is proposed:

New paragraph 11: ***“There are various population groups for which some uncertainty may arise about their inclusion in the usually resident population. The following persons should always be included:***

(a) *Persons found at the moment of the enumeration to whom the concept of usual residence does not apply.*

(b) *National military, naval and diplomatic personnel and their families, located outside the country.*

(c) *Foreign persons working for international organisations (not including foreign diplomats or military forces), provided that they meet the criteria for the usual residence in the country.*

(d) *Merchant seamen and fishermen usually resident in the country but at sea at the time of the census (including those who have no place of residence other than their quarters aboard ship).*

(e) *Persons who may be illegal, irregular or undocumented migrants, as well as asylum seekers and persons who have applied for or been granted refugee status or similar types of international protections, provided that they meet the criteria for the usual residence in the country.*

(f) *Persons who cross a frontier daily or weekly to work or study in another country, provided that they meet the criteria for the usual residence in the country.*

(g) *Children born in the twelve months before the census reference time and whose families are usually resident in the country at the census reference time.*

(h) *Persons whose stay in the country is exactly one year.*

(i) *Persons studying abroad for one year or more to attain the primary or secondary level of education, regardless of the frequency of return to the family home located within the country. If the person is also working abroad, the same rules for cross-border workers apply.*

(j) *Persons studying abroad for one year or more to attain the tertiary level of education, if they return to the family home located within the country on at least a weekly basis.*

(k) *Option A: Persons who regularly live in more than one country during a year, if they are found in the country at the moment of the enumeration.*

Option B: Persons who regularly live part of the year abroad, if they consider the main place of usual residence to be within the country. This does not apply to children alternating between households located in different countries, who are included in the usually resident population if the household where they spend the majority of the year before the census is within the country. Where an equal amount of time is spent with both parents, the country of usual residence should be the same of the parent/household with whom the child is at the census reference time.

Option C: Persons who regularly lives in more than one country during a year, if they spend within the country the majority of the year before the census."

33. A mirror list is then given for the persons to be excluded from the usually resident population:

New paragraph 12: *"The following persons should instead always be excluded from the usually resident population:*

(a) *Foreign military, naval and diplomatic personnel and their families, located in the country, regardless of their place of usual residence.*

(b) *Persons whose stay in the country is less than one year, even if for a single day. In case of leap years, the duration of reference is 366 days.*

(c) *Primary or secondary level students whose family home is located abroad, regardless of the duration of their stay. However, if these persons are also working in the country, then the identification of the place of usual residence follows the same rules for cross-border workers.*

(d) *Third level students whose stay is one year or more, if their return to the family home located abroad is done with at least a weekly frequency.*

(e) *Third level students whose stay abroad is one year or more, if their return to the family home located within the country is on irregular basis, or anyway with lower frequency than on weekly basis.*

(f) Option A: *Persons who regularly live in more than one country during a year, if they are not found in the country at the moment of the enumeration.*

Option B: *Persons who regularly live part of the year abroad, if they consider the main place of usual residence to be abroad. This does not apply to children alternating between households located in different countries, who are excluded from the usually resident population if the household where they spend the majority of the year before the census is abroad. Where an equal amount of time is spent with both parents, the country of usual residence should be the same of the parent/household with whom the child is at the census reference time.*

Option C: *Person regularly livings in more than one country during a year, if they do not spend within the country the majority of the year before the census.”*

34. The category of ‘students’ is particularly controversial. Students attending primary and secondary education are considered to be fully dependant on the family home and thus still part of it; if this is not the case, as witnessed by a working activity, then the classification of those persons follows the usual rules. Third level students are presumably more autonomous (and also more likely to work at the same time) and therefore their situation is considered equivalent to that of workers. However, they could also be assumed to be only temporarily abroad, especially if they return to the family home during the pauses of the university classes (e.g., summer break), although not on weekly basis. The distinction is not trivial, and may lead to substantial changes in the population size for those cities which host important universities and for those countries/areas which regularly see their young people to leave in order to continue their studies. What would make different their situation from the case, for instance, of a person in military service (see paragraph 14 above), is that their experience (studying abroad) is repeated over time. Therefore, a student who goes abroad to follow a single educational programme of less than one year with no breaks (e.g., the Erasmus Programme - European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students’) would keep the family home as place of usual residence (like in the example of military service in paragraph 14 above); on the contrary, a student who is attending abroad a multi-year university programme and returns on irregular basis should have the term-time address as the place of usual residence.

35. In summary, the current practice of inclusion/exclusion of students in the usually resident population of a country varies across UNECE countries and there is a clear need for clarification about their classification. The allocation of the students may not be here completely settled and calls perhaps for thoughtful discussions which may lead to different proposals, but this category should be consistently classified across countries to avoid double counting or under-coverage. The paragraphs referring to third level students may actually be considered redundant when the article on persons crossing daily a border is referred to, but this is perhaps one case in which redundancy may help.

36. Persons with multiple residences, including children alternating between households, are another difficult case. The option A in New paragraphs 11 and 12 looks at

this category as persons with no concept of usual residence, as they are in fact. Therefore, where a person regularly lives in more than one country during a year, the rules for persons with no concept of usual residence apply, in full consistency with the general approach, and no distinction is necessary between persons with multiple residences, children, etc. Option B proposes an amendment to the current recommendations which replaces the application of the criterion of ‘most of the time’ with something based on ‘continuous time’, although established in a subjective way. However, such amendment cannot be applied to the children alternating between households, for whom a solution consistent with the ‘continuous time’ has not been found. Option C relies fully on the criterion of ‘most of the time’, as exception to the regular definition of usual residence. Also in this latter case, no further distinction is necessary between sub-categories.

37. Finally, about the categories of military, naval and diplomatic personnel, the rationale of their inclusion/exclusion is the possible confidentiality of the information, as well as the fact that they are supposedly listed by the authorities of their countries, and therefore it is easier to get basic data about them via this latter channel. This does not apply to the personnel of international organizations, as they are usually not linked to national governments.

E. Implementation of the concept of usually resident population: geographic allocation within the country

38. There are instead persons for whom there is no uncertainty about their inclusion in the usually resident population, but some uncertainty about their allocation within the territory of the country. The following amendments are proposed to the list in the CES Recommendations paragraph 162:

New paragraph 13: *“There are also population groups for which some uncertainty may arise in defining their place of usual residence within the country. The recommended conventional treatment of these cases is as follows:*

(a) *Persons who work away from home during the week and who return to the family home at week-ends should consider the family home as their place of usual residence.*

(b) *Children in primary and secondary education who are away from home during the school term should consider their family home as their place of usual residence.*

(c) *Third level students who are away from home while at college or university should consider their term-time address as their place of usual residence regardless of whether this is an institution (such as a boarding school) or a private residence. However, likewise the workers, those who study away from home during the week and who return to the family home at week-ends should consider the family home as their place of usual residence.*

(d) *Persons who study and work at the same time will be allocated to the pertinent geographic division according to the rules for workers.*

(e) *Option A: Where a person regularly lives in more than one residence within the country during the year, the rules for persons with no concept of usual residence applies.*

Option B: Where a person regularly lives in more than one residence within the country during the year, the one that (s)he considers to be his/her place of usual residence should be taken as such. These persons are not considered to be persons with no usual residence.

Option C: *Where a person regularly lives in more than one residence **within the country** during the year, the one where he/she spends the majority of the year **before the census** should be taken as his/her place of usual residence. **These persons are not considered to be persons with no usual residence.***

(f) *A child who alternates between two households **within the country** (for instance after his or her parents have divorced) should consider the household where he or she spends the majority of the year **before the census** as his or her place of usual residence. Where an equal amount of time is spent with both parents, the place of usual residence should be the same of the parent/household with whom the child is at the census reference time.*

(g) *For the (national) military, naval and diplomatic personnel and their families located outside the country the following classification rules should be applied:*

(1) *If they are residing abroad for less than 12 months and they are intending to return to the place of departure, they should be allocated within the country in accordance with the rules for usual residence. In particular, they could be allocated to (by decreasing order of priority):*

a. *The family home address within the country, if any.*

b. *The duty station within the country to which they were attached before leaving.*

(2) *If they are residing abroad for at least 12 months or if they are not intending to return to the place of departure (although returning in the country within a 12-month period), they should be attributed to a 'virtual region' (extra-region) of the country of departure."*

39. Rules about geographic allocation within a country of workers, students and persons with multiple residences replicate in substance what proposed for the inclusion /exclusion of those categories in the usually resident population. Concerning the allocation of national military personnel and similar categories located abroad, the distinction about the intention or not to return to the place of departure within the country is due to the application of the recommendation CES paragraph 162.g referring to persons with no concept of usual residence (i.e., those whose actual plus intended duration of stay in a defined place is less than 12 months, and with no intention of returning to the previous place of residence), for whom the place of enumeration should be taken as place of usual residence. It should be noted that, for each country, the number of persons allocated to an extra-region is the same across all geographical levels.

III. Conclusive remarks

40. The Annex in ECE/CES/GE.41/2013/11/Add.1 contains a number of additional amendments (e.g., on CES Recommendations paragraph 178) which have not been described in the main part of this document in order to focus on the most important conceptual adaptations. However, the proposals and amendments here presented are not meant to represent an exhaustive list of revisions. Discussion on the proposed points and/or further reflections may well take to the formulation of additional proposals.

41. Further, what has been presented above relies on the continuation of the definition of place of usual residence, based on the described criteria, as the main international population concept for the UNECE region. However, this point should not be taken for granted, and discussions on this issue may as well lead to the adoption of different criteria

(e.g., ‘most of the time’ instead of ‘continuous time’) for the usual residence, or even to different concepts.

IV. References

UNECE Task Force on population to be enumerated and geographical characteristics (2013): "*Population Definitions at the 2010 Censuses Round in the Countries of the UNECE Region*". Paper for the Joint UNECE-Eurostat meeting of the Experts Group on Population and Housing Censuses, 30 September – 3 October 2013, Geneva (ECE/CES/GE.41/2013/10)

UNECE (2006): "*Conference of European Statisticians Recommendations for the 2010 Censuses of Population and Housing*". United Nations, Geneva. Available at: http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/stats/publications/CES_2010_Census_Recommendations_English.pdf
