

ENGLISH ONLY

**STATISTICAL COMMISSION and
UN ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR
EUROPE (UNECE)**

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

**CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN
STATISTICIANS**

Joint UNECE-Eurostat Work Session on Population Censuses
Organized in cooperation with UNFPA
(Geneva, 23-25 November 2004)

Session 4 – Invited paper

**THE PLACE OF USUAL RESIDENCE AND OTHER GEOGRAPHIC
CHARACTERISTICS: NATIONAL PRACTICES IN THE 2000 ROUND OF CENSUSES
AND COMMENTS ON THE ECE CENSUS RECOMMENDATIONS**

Submitted by Statistical Division, UNECE¹

INTRODUCTION

1. This paper presents an analysis of the practices followed by countries in the ECE region on the occasion of the 2000 round of population censuses, with regard to the following topics: place of usual residence, total population, locality and urban and rural areas. In particular, the paper aims at evaluating the general compliance with the definitions given, for each of these topics, in the “Recommendations for the 2000 Censuses of population and housing in the ECE Region”² (in the paper referred as the “ECE Recommendations” or “2000 Recommendations”), jointly developed by ECE and Eurostat.

¹ The paper was prepared by Paolo Valente of the Social and Demographic Statistics Section, with the valuable assistance of Chiara Orefice for information and data processing. The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the United Nations.

² United Nations Statistical Commission and Economic Commission for Europe Conference of European Statisticians, Economic Commission for Europe Committee on Human Settlements, Statistical Standards and Studies – No. 49, “*Recommendations for the 2000 Censuses of Population and Housing in the ECE Region* jointly prepared by the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and the Statistical Office of the European Communities”, United Nations, New York and Geneva, 1998. Throughout the present paper, reference is made to different paragraphs of the document.

2. On the basis of the analysis of the practices followed by countries in the 2000 round of censuses, some issues are discussed for consideration during the work on the revision of the ECE Recommendations for the 2010 round of censuses.

3. It should be noted that the paper is based on a preliminary analysis of the replies (submitted by 44 countries) to the “ECE questionnaire on population and housing censuses”. In preparing the paper, some errors and inconsistencies were found in the results of the ECE questionnaire. In most cases, the results were corrected on the basis of clarifications provided by countries or additional information available to the author, but it is possible that some error and inconsistencies are still present in the information presented in the paper. Therefore, attention should be paid to the general trends presented in the paper, rather than on individual practices followed by specific countries.

I. PLACE OF USUAL RESIDENCE (core topic (1) in the 2000 recommendations)

4. In the framework of the census recommendations, the definition of place of usual residence is one of the most important and critical issues (if not THE most important), since this definition, and the way it is applied during the census, influences directly the census results in terms of the total usually resident population, at the national level but also at the lower territorial levels.

5. The importance of this definition has increased further in the recent years, because of the increasing number of persons who have multiple residences and the increased mobility of the population: more and more people move between different places for different reasons and with various frequencies (daily, weekly or yearly, as it is the case for seasonal workers or students), and migration - including both legal and undocumented migration - is a phenomenon of increasing importance in most countries. For all these persons, the identification of the place of usual residence may not be easy, and often it depends on the definition adopted.

6. In this section, the definition of place of usual residence included in the 2000 census recommendations is presented. Then, the compliance of countries in the ECE region with this definition and the treatment of specific population groups in the 2000 round of censuses are discussed, on the basis of the results of the ECE questionnaire. Finally, some problems in the definition used in 2000 are discussed, in order to provide a basis for the discussion on possible changes to this definition for the 2010 recommendations.

I.I The definition of place of usual residence in the 2000 census recommendations

7. In the 2000 census recommendations, the place of usual residence was defined as “...*the geographic place where the enumerated person usually resides; this may be the same as, or different from, the place where he/she actually is at the time of the Census; or it may be his/her legal residence. A person's usual residence should be that at which he/she spends most of his/her daily night-rest*” (para. 30).

8. After this general definition, the recommendations included a reference to the recommendations on international migration statistics, in particular to the distinction between:

- a) Long-term migrants, who move to another country for a period of at least one year, and should be counted in the country of destination (which becomes their new country of usual residence); and

- b) Short-term migrant, who move to another country for a period of at least three months but less than one year, and should be counted in the country of origin (which remains their country of usual residence) (paras. 31-35)

9. The recommendations also presented a list of special groups of persons who may have difficulties in stating their place of usual residence, including persons who maintain more than one residence, students who live in school or university residences for part of the year and elsewhere during vacations and so on (para. 36). For these groups, the general definition (see para. 7 above) was still valid, but it was specified: *“For persons with a spouse/partner and/or children, the usual residence should be that at which they spend the majority of the time with their family”*.

10. Persons in the special group composed of “nomads, homeless and roofless persons, vagrants and persons with no concept of a usual address” had to be considered, according to the recommendations, *“as usually resident where they are enumerated”*.

11. Considering that it could be expected that different countries would treat these groups in different ways, the recommendations included the following paragraph: *“The treatment of all these cases should be set out clearly in the census instructions and, if possible, objective rules should be formulated for dealing with them. The treatment of each of these groups of persons should also be described in the census report and, where feasible, counts or estimates of the number of persons in each group should be given”* (end of para. 36).

I.II Compliance with the recommended definition of place of usual residence in the 2000 round

12. Out of the 44 countries that replied to the ECE questionnaire on population and housing censuses, the large majority (37 countries, that is 86 per cent) stated that they complied with the recommended definition, and only seven countries appear to have adopted a different definition.

13. Three countries (Austria, Czech Republic and Luxembourg) adopted a different definition that was imposed by legislation. These definitions in general are not based on the time spent in the place of usual residence (which was the key element of the definition included in the recommendations) but rather on the family, professional and social ties between the person and the place of residence, and in two cases on the official registration of the person in the local population register (or “legal residence”).

14. In the case of **Austria**, *“...the usual residence of a person is her/his main residence and is defined by Registration Act as the focus of his/her life. The focus is defined by duration of residence, place of employment or school, starting point of the commuting way, place of residence of the family members, the person's functions in public or private corporations”*. In Austria people are registered in the local population register of the commune where they have their main residence. It should be noted that in Austria it is possible to have a secondary residence and be also registered at the commune of the secondary residence. In the **Czech Republic**, the place of usual residence is the address *“...where the person has his/her family, parents, flat or job”*. Each person can have only one place of usual residence. In **Luxembourg**, *“The normal place of residence is the place where various persons forming a household live together or the place where a single person forming a household by himself/herself usually lives. The address of this place is usually the address under which the person is registered with their commune.”*

15. Three other countries (Australia, Canada and Switzerland) used a definition of usual residence that was based on the same concept adopted in the recommendations (that is, the place where the person spend the majority of the time) but with different “variations”.

16. In **Switzerland**, like in Austria, it was possible to indicate more than one residence. All persons with more than one residence had to fill in a personal questionnaire at any residence. The following concepts of residence are used:

- *The economic (or main) residence is the municipality where the person spends the majority of the time, use the infrastructures and from where it leave to reach his/her place of work or study.*
- *The civil residence for Swiss nationals is the municipality where is stored the “acte d’origine” or where they pay their taxes. For foreigners, it is the municipality that delivered the stay permit.*

In most cases the two places coincide, with some exceptions, including persons living in institutions, students in boarding homes and persons who live during the week near their place of work or study (economic residence) and for the weekend come back to their family place (civil residence). For the purpose of the census, the economic residence concept was taken into account.

17. In **Canada**, the usual place of residence is “...*the dwelling where a person lives most of the time, that is, where he or she spends the major part of the year*”. This definition was adopted for various reasons: to meet users' needs, to allow comparability with previous census, and to be consistent with other statistical surveys.

18. In **Australia**, a similar definition was adopted: “*Usual residence is the address where the person has lived or intends to live for six months or more in 2001*” [Census date was 6 August 2001]

19. In the **Netherlands**, where the last census was based on population registers, the recommended definition was not adopted because the information on the place of usual residence was taken from the population registers.

I.III Treatment of special groups of persons

20. The ECE questionnaire also provided detailed information on special instructions given by countries (in the census forms or to the enumerators) for the treatment of the special groups of persons who may have difficulties in stating their place of usual residence, as listed in para. 36 of the recommendations.

21. In general, it appeared that the majority of countries (between 50 and 65 per cent depending on the various population groups) gave special instructions to define the place of residence for most of these groups. Among the countries that did not give special instructions, there were obviously the countries where the census was based on registers, which applied the rules for registration in the registers.

22. For some of these special population groups, the majority of countries gave similar instructions, which usually followed more or less closely the recommendations. For other groups, instead, there were significant differences in the instructions given by the various countries, and often these instructions were not in line with the recommendations.

23. Some countries treated all these “difficult” population groups (or most of them) following the same general principle. For instance, in **Austria** the general principle valid for most groups was that persons were enumerated at their *legal residence* (or *main residence*, as defined in section I.II). In **Italy**, persons having more residences (including most of these population groups) had to fill in two (or more) forms, one in the place of usual residence (where they had to fill in the section reserved to persons usually resident in the dwelling) and one in each of the places of temporary residence (where they had to fill in a different section of the census form). In the **United States**, specific “residence rules” were developed to provide instructions on the place where persons (in particular members of “difficult” groups) had to be counted (see WP.16 on “U.S. Residence Rules for Census 2000”, or http://www.census.gov/population/www/censusdata/resid_rules.html).

24. The main results on the instructions given by countries for the treatment of the various groups are summarised as follows:

i) Persons who maintain more than one residence, e.g. a town house and a country house:

25. Almost two thirds of the countries (28 out of 44) gave special instructions for this group, which seems to indicate that this group of persons is significant in many countries and that special instructions are required for the identification of the place of usual residence.

26. In most cases, the instructions given followed the general definition of the recommendations, in the sense that the place of usual residence was defined as the place where the person lives the majority of the time (or of the rest time), with some variations, including: “the address where they had spent most of the nights during the last month” (**Israel**); “the place of living majority of the time in the course of a year” (**Serbia and Montenegro**); “the place where they spend bigger part of a year” (**The FYROM**); “the place where person live more than six months of the year” (**Turkey**).

27. Only a few countries included in the instructions a reference to the family of the person: “The place where person's household lives should be regarded as person's permanent place of residence” (**Estonia**); “the place where majority of time with the family is spent” (**Lithuania**); “[the main address] is where they and their family spent the majority of their time” (**United Kingdom**).

28. For some countries, the place of usual residence for persons in this category was defined as the place of legal residence (**Austria** and **Latvia**), or the place of “normal” residence with no reference to time or other concepts (**Luxembourg**), or it was determined by the respondents themselves (**Ireland**).

ii) Students who live in a school or university residence, as boarders in a household or as a one person household for part of the year and elsewhere during vacations

29. Even this group of persons can be considered as an important and “difficult” group, since 31 countries out of 43 (70 per cent) issued specific instructions to define the place of usual residence.

30. The results show a clear division in how students in this category were treated: in 11 countries they were considered as resident at their family’s address, while in 10 countries they were considered as resident at the school or university residence.

31. In some countries, information on students in this group was collected at both places. For instance, in **Poland** they were counted as permanently staying (but temporarily absent) with their family, and temporarily staying at the school or university residence. In **Switzerland** they had to fill two census forms in the two places (like in Italy). In the **United Kingdom**, they were counted as resident at their term-time address, but some basic information was also collected at their home address for the purposes of household/family composition analyses.

iii) Persons who live away from their homes during the working week and return at weekends

32. For this group, 25 countries out of 44 issued specific instructions. In the majority of cases (16 countries that is 64 per cent) these persons were counted in the place where they were living with their family, as it was recommended. In **Cyprus** and **Israel**, however, this was the case only for married persons, while unmarried persons were counted at the address where they spend most of the time.

33. In **Greece** and the **United States**, all persons in this category (married and unmarried) were counted in the place where they spend the majority of the time.

34. In five countries, information on these persons was collected at both places. In **Italy** and **Switzerland** they had to fill two census forms in the two places.

iv) Persons in compulsory military service

35. Instructions for this group of persons were given in 23 countries (several countries indicated that there is no compulsory military service and therefore this group doesn't exist). In the majority of cases, persons in this group were counted in the place where they live with their family. Only in the **Russian Federation** and **Kyrgyzstan** they were enumerated at the place of the military service (this might also depend on the length of the compulsory military service).

v) Members of the regular armed forces who live in a military barrack or camp but maintain a private residence elsewhere

36. For this category of persons, 24 countries issued specific instructions. In 12 countries these persons were counted at their private address, but in some of these countries (like **Croatia** or the **UK**) this was valid only if they have a family at that address, otherwise they were counted in the military barrack or camp. Only in the **Russian Federation** and **Romania** they were enumerated at the military barrack or camp.

vi) Persons who have been an inmate of a hospital, welfare institution, prison, etc., for a sufficiently long time to weaken their ties with their previous residence to which they may return eventually

37. The results show that this group is one of the most "problematic" ones. In fact, 31 countries (71 per cent) issued specific instructions, and 5 countries also prepared special enumeration procedures for this group.

38. In 8 countries, persons in this group were counted as resident in the institution only if they had been living there (or in some cases if they were expected to live there) for at least one year (or 6 months in **Canada** and the **UK**). In 8 more countries they were counted in the institution with no reference to the length of their stay. Only in a few countries (including **Luxembourg**, **Poland** and **the FYROM**) they were enumerated with their family.

vii) Persons who have left the country temporarily but are expected to return after some time (up to 1 year of absence)

39. Some 25 countries gave special instructions for this group. In the majority of countries, these persons were enumerated at their usual place of residence in the country (normally with their family), or at the place of residence where they were living before leaving the country.

40. A few countries set a maximum length of the absence, beyond which the persons were not enumerated as resident for census purposes. This limit is 3 months in **Ireland** and 6 months in **Switzerland** and the **United Kingdom** (in this country also persons who were intended to be abroad for more than 6 months were not counted as residents).

41. In the **United States**, persons temporarily away on vacation or a business trip were counted at their usual residence. However, U.S. citizens who were working, studying, or living overseas on census day were not counted in the census (only those employed overseas as civilians by the U.S. Government and their family members were counted as part of the U.S. overseas population and not as part of the U.S. resident population). The term “temporarily” was not publicly defined, but the working assumption was “under six months of the year”.

viii) Nomads, homeless and roofless persons, vagrants and persons with no concept of a usual address [Note: according to the 2000 recommendations, persons in this group should be treated as usually resident where they are enumerated]

42. Even for this group special instructions were given by a significant number of countries (25). The instruction given most frequently was to consider these persons as resident in the place where they were enumerated (9 countries). In 3 more countries, they were considered as resident in the municipality where they were enumerated.

43. In four countries, the place of residence was the institution or shelter for homeless where they were enumerated, with no indications of the treatment of those who do not live in institutions of shelters.

44. In some countries, special procedures were set up for this group of persons: In **Israel** lists of homeless persons were collected from the municipalities, in **Romania** a special registration was carried out by the Ministry of the Interior, and in **Hungary** and **Switzerland** they were listed in “virtual census districts” and “virtual buildings” respectively.

ix) Children of separated/divorced parents who live similar portions of time with each of the two parents

45. This last “special” category was not mentioned in the census recommendations, but it was included in the ECE questionnaire because it is a phenomenon of increasing relevance in various countries.

46. Only a few countries gave instructions for this category of children: in **Canada**, **UK** and **United States** they were counted as resident at the address where they live most of the time. In Canada and United States it was specified that children spending equal time with each parent were counted where they were staying on census day.

47. In **Croatia** they were counted at the address of the parent who was given the custody by the court at the moment of the divorce.

I.IV Double-counting or undercounting problems for specific population groups

48. Many of the special population groups discussed in the previous section, for which it may be difficult stating the place of usual residence, are also group “at risk” of double counting or undercounting. This risk, in general, derives from the specific characteristics of the various groups, but also on the instructions given for establishing the place of usual residence. In fact, these instructions ideally should be aimed at minimising the risk of double counting or undercounting, but this is not always the case.

49. According to the replies given to the ECE questionnaire, 25 out of 44 countries (57 per cent) experienced either double counting or undercounting problems for specific population groups. More in particular, 21 countries (48 per cent) listed one or more groups with problems of double counting and 24 countries (54 per cent) listed one or more groups with problems of undercounting.

50. The population group considered at highest risk of **double counting** is the group of students who live near the school or university for part of the year and elsewhere during vacations (8 countries). Other population groups characterised by risk of double counting due to the fact of having multiple residences are persons who maintain more than one residence (6 countries) and persons who live away from home during the working week and return at weekends (4 countries). Persons in various types of institutions (including hospitals, nursing facilities and homes for elderly people) were considered at risk of double counting in 5 countries, while problems of double counting for children of divorced parents were mentioned by 2 countries.

51. With regard to **undercounting**, several countries considered among the population groups at risk various categories of persons which are interrelated to each other: young people between 15 and 30, in particular males (5 countries), people living alone (3 countries), mobile people – usually young adults - who have more than one residences for work or study and for whom the concept of usual residence is not straightforward (5 countries), and persons temporarily absent from their place of usual residence (3 countries).

52. Immigrants have been indicated among the population groups at risk of undercounting by 9 countries, including 4 countries that specified illegal immigrants and 2 countries that specified recent immigrants. Related population groups considered at risk of undercounting were “households with language difficulties” (UK), “minorities” (USA), “indigenous people in urban areas” (Australia) and “Bedouins” (Israel). Other population groups with problems of undercounting are the homeless (6 countries) and very young children (3 countries).

I.V Concluding remarks on the topic “place of usual residence” and on possible changes to the 2010 recommendations

Concept of place of usual residence and general definition (para. 30 of the recommendations):

53. The replies to the ECE questionnaire show that the large majority of countries complied with the concept and the definition of place of usual residence included in the 2000 recommendations. However, the treatment of selected groups of persons (like students) characterised by multiple residences and/or high mobility posed serious problems, and there was significant variability in the practices followed by countries in this regard. Although specific instructions should be given in the new recommendations for the treatment of these groups (see below), the possible adoption of a more detailed definition of place of usual residence, like for instance “the place where the person spent most of the nights [or most of the time] in the last year” could perhaps help to address these problems.

Treatment of migrants (paras. 31-35 of the recommendations):

54. The text in these paragraphs should be rearranged to make clearer how different groups of long-term or short-term out-migrants and in-migrants should be treated. The objective should be to address problems like the frequent undercounting of immigrants (in particular of recent and illegal immigrants), or the tendency observed in many countries to count as “usually resident but temporarily absent” persons who have actually left the place/country for more than one year, and therefore should not be counted.

55. Para. 35 in the current recommendations, in fact, address the latter problem, but the wording could be improved, for instance to read as follows: “*A person who is absent from his or her previous place/country of usual residence for one year or more should no longer be considered as usually resident in this place/country (and temporarily absent), but should be considered as usually resident in the new place/country of residence*”.

Treatment of special groups of persons who may have difficulties in stating their place of usual residence (para.36 of the recommendations):

56. For the 2010 recommendations, it would be important to improve the text on the treatment of these groups of persons, in particular the groups characterised by multiple residences and high mobility, which represent an increasing proportion of the population in many countries.

57. The list of special groups probably needs to be revised, and it could be useful to give specific instructions for the treatment of each group (in other words, to draft for these groups something similar to the “residence rules” prepared for the US census in 2000).

58. A particularly difficult group is represented by *students* who live in a place during term-time and in another place (usually at their family’s address) during vacation: the treatment of this group varied significantly across countries, and a large number of countries experienced problems of double counting for this group.

59. Other groups characterised by high risk of double counting are *persons who maintain more than one residence* and *persons who live away from their homes during the working week and return at weekends*. A more precise definition of place of usual residence (like: “*the place where the person spent most of the nights [or most of the time] in the last year*”) could help to better define the place of usual residence for these groups and reduce the risk of double counting.

60. The instruction “*For persons with a spouse/partner and/or children, the usual residence should be that at which they spend the majority of the time with their family*”, that in the recommendations is referred to all groups (a) to (i), perhaps should be referred to a selection of these groups only.

61. For *nomads* and the *homeless*, the recommendations should be modified to stress the fact that persons in this group have to be enumerated in the usually resident population even though normally they don’t have a usual address (with the objective of reducing undercounting).

62. Countries where census data are taken from registers represent a special case, because the rules for registration in the registers should be taken into consideration. It may be advisable to include in the new recommendations specific instructions for countries producing census data from registers.

II. TOTAL POPULATION (derived core topic (a) in the 2000 rec.)

63. With regard to population counts at censuses (at the national level and also for the various sub-national territorial divisions), there are different concepts of total population that can be used. The two most common concepts are:

- 1) the total usually resident population (also called *de jure population*), that is the total number of persons usually resident in the territory at the time of the census, regardless of their actual presence or temporary absence at the time of the census; and
- 2) the total present population (also called *de facto population*), that is the population that is present in the territory at the time of the census.

64. With regard to census enumeration methods, the persons can be counted at their place of usual residence (censuses of this type are also called *de jure censuses*) or at the place where they are found at the time of the censuses (censuses of this type are also called *de facto censuses*). It should be noted that even when a census is carried out on a *de facto* basis, it is still possible to produce figures for the *de jure population*, if information is collected on the place of usual residence of the individuals.

65. It is clear that the choice between a *de jure* and a *de facto* approach has major implications on the organisation of the enumeration. On the other hand, the census results in terms of *de jure* population (at the national and sub-national levels) will be directly influenced by the definition of place of usual residence adopted and by its implementation during the census.

II.I The definition of total population in the 2000 recommendations

66. According to the 2000 census recommendations, countries had to compile a total usually resident population count (that is, the *de jure population*) for each territorial division, by adding persons usually resident and present at the time of the census and persons usually resident but temporarily absent at the time of the census (para. 40 of the recommendations).

67. The recommendations also included the following text: “... *it is not always possible to collect information about persons absent from their place of usual residence [...] particularly if a whole household is temporarily absent at the time of the census. Provision must therefore be made to collect information about such persons at the place where they are found at the time of the census [...] and if necessary "transfer" them to their place or territorial division of usual residence*”.

68. The following groups of persons had to be included in the total usually resident population, according to the recommendations (para. 41):

- (a) nomads;
- (b) vagrants;
- (c) persons living in remote areas;
- (d) military, naval and diplomatic personnel and their families, located outside the country;
- (e) merchant seamen and fishermen 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);
- (f) civilian residents temporarily working in another country;
- (g) civilian residents who cross a frontier daily to work in another country;
- (h) civilian residents other than those in (d) to (g) temporarily absent from the country;
- (i) refugees (as defined under the Geneva convention) in the country.

69. The following groups of persons, instead, had NOT to be considered part of the total usually resident population:

- (j) foreign military, naval and diplomatic personnel and their families, temporarily located in the country;
- (k) civilian aliens temporarily working in the country;
- (l) asylum seekers;
- (m) civilian aliens who cross a frontier daily to work in the country;
- (n) civilian aliens other than those in groups (k) and (m) temporarily in the country e.g. tourists.

II.II Compliance with the recommended definition of total population in the 2000 round

70. According to the replies to the ECE questionnaire, the large majority of countries (39 out of 44, that is 89 per cent) compiled figures for the total usually resident population, complying with the 2000 recommendations.

71. Three countries conducted a de facto census: **Australia** (to avoid "...in the counting process the definitional complexities inherent in a de jure census"), **Ireland** (to ensure comparability with previous censuses and because it was more acceptable to respondents) and **Turkey**. Australia and Ireland, however, were able to compile figures for the de jure population, while Turkey (where the curfew was declared on census day to facilitate the enumeration) compiled figures for the de facto population only.

72. In **Austria** according to the legislation the population count is done by adding the persons with the "main residence" in the territory (see also section I.II). In **France** there are two concepts of population: the total population used for administrative purposes, where some persons are counted two times, and the statistical population, where each person is counted one time. In **Greece**, finally, the resident population is counted by adding members of the household present or temporarily absent and temporary guests.

II.III Other population counts

73. If the large majority of ECE countries compiled the figure for the total usually resident population, a significant number of countries also compiled additional figures for other population counts. About half of the countries, in fact, compiled the figure for the total present population (22 countries) and for the working population (21 countries). Eight countries compiled data for the nationals living abroad and three countries for the population temporarily absent from the country, while seven countries calculated the total legally resident population (considering only countries where this concept was different from that of usually resident population).

74. In the **United Kingdom**, the daytime population was compiled, as a combination of usually resident population and workplace population. A similar concept was adopted in **Italy** to calculate the population that "uses" the territory, obtained by adding to the usually resident population the non resident population that "uses" the territory for the most part of the year, and subtracting the resident population that do not "use" the territory of residence for most part of the year.

II.IV Inclusion of selected population groups in the population counts

75. With regard to the count of the total usually resident population, the ECE questionnaire also provided information on the treatment of some of the groups of persons that, according to the recommendations (para. 41), had to be included in (or excluded from) the count. In fact, the different treatment of these groups in different countries in terms of inclusion in the usually resident population would affect the international comparability of data on total population, and could even result in counting some persons in the usually resident population of two countries. The results on the treatment of these groups with regard to the inclusion in the usually resident population, in the present population or in other population counts are presented in table 1.

Table 1: Treatment of specific population groups with regard to the inclusion in the usually resident population, in the present population or in other population counts

Groups of persons	2000 Recommendations	National practices in the 2000 censuses				Total number of valid replies
	Treatment with regard to the inclusion in the usually resident population, according to the 2000 recommendations	Included in the count of the total resident population	NOT included in the count of the total resident population...			
			...but included in the count of present population	...but included in other population counts	... and not relevant for any population count	
Nomads	To be included in the usually resident population	22	1	1	16	40
Homeless	To be included in the usually resident population	37	1	0	5	44
Persons who have left the country temporarily but are expected to return after some time (up to 1 year of absence)	To be included in the usually resident population	39	0	0	4	43
Military, naval and diplomatic personnel and their families, located outside the country	To be included in the usually resident population	31	1	3	8	43
Merchant seamen and fishermen resident in the country but at sea at the time of the census	To be included in the usually resident population	35	1	0	6	42
Refugees (as defined under the Geneva Convention) in the country	To be included in the usually resident population	28	8	1	5	42
Foreign military, naval and diplomatic personnel and their families located in the country	NOT to be included in the usually resident population	9	7	0	26	43
Foreign workers with a legal but temporary status (up to 1 year), as for example seasonal workers;	NOT to be included in the usually resident population	15	18	2	8	43
Asylum seekers or other foreigners granted a temporary protection status	NOT to be included in the usually resident population	22	13	0	7	42
Foreigners living in the country though not having the right to stay in the country (i.e. undocumented immigrants)	(Not specified in the 2000 recommendations)	16	8	1	15	41

Source: ECE questionnaire on population and housing censuses (preliminary results)

76. The first five groups in the table are **population groups that had to be included in the usually resident population**, according to the recommendations, but a significant number of countries did not comply with this instruction. In particular, the group of *nomads* was included in the usually resident population only in 22 countries out of 40 (55 per cent). In 16 countries (40 per cent), nomads were not included in any population count.

77. Another category for which many countries did not comply with the recommendations is *refugees*, which were included in the usually resident population by two thirds of the countries only (28 out of 42), while in 8 countries they were included in the present (but not resident) population only.

78. The category "*Military, naval and diplomatic personnel and their families, located outside the country*" was counted in the usually resident population by 31 out of 43 countries (72 per cent). The two groups of persons that were included in the usually resident population (complying with the recommendations) by the highest number of countries are "*Persons who have left the country temporarily but are expected to return after some time (up to 1 year of absence)*" (39 out of 43 countries, that is 91 per cent) and "*Merchant seamen and fishermen resident in the country but at sea at the time of the census*" (35 out of 42 countries, that is 83 per cent).

79. The following three groups presented in table 1 are **population groups that had NOT to be included in the usually resident population**, according to the recommendations, but even for these groups a significant number of countries did not comply with the recommendations. In particular, "*asylum seekers or other foreigners granted a temporary protection status*" were included in the usually resident population by more than half of the countries (22 out of 42), "*foreign workers with a legal but temporary status (up to 1 year), as for example seasonal workers*" were included by 35 per cent of the countries (15 out of 43), and "*foreign military, naval and diplomatic personnel and their families located in the country*" were included by 21 per cent of the countries (9 out of 43).

80. The last population group presented in table 1 was not covered by the 2000 census recommendations, but it is actually an important population group in many countries: "*foreigners living in the country though not having the right to stay in the country (i.e. undocumented immigrants)*". According to the replies to the ECE questionnaire, this group was included in the count of the usually resident population in 16 out of 41 countries (39 per cent), they were counted in the present (but not resident) population in 8 countries (20 per cent) and they were not included in any population count in 15 countries (37 per cent).

II.V Concluding remarks on the topic "total population" and on possible changes to the 2010 recommendations

81. The large majority of countries complied with the recommendations by compiling the figure for the total usually resident population. However, the practices followed by countries in terms of inclusion in (or exclusion from) the usually resident population of the groups of persons listed in para. 41 of the recommendations varied significantly. In particular, *nomads* and *refugees* were not included in the usually resident population in many countries. Refugees were often included in the present population, but not in the resident population. Nomads were not included in any population count in 40 per cent of the countries. On the other side, some groups which were not to be included in the usually resident population according the recommendations, were in fact included by a significant number of countries. This is the case for *asylum seekers* and "*foreign workers with a legal but temporary status (up to 1 year), as for example seasonal workers*".

82. In the 2010 recommendations, the lists of groups to be included in (or excluded from) the usually resident population should be revised, and the importance of including in the usually resident population groups that in many countries were not included in the 2000 round (like nomads and refugees) should be stressed. Moreover, the treatment of undocumented immigrants with regard to the inclusion or not in the usually resident population should be specified.

III LOCALITY (derived core topic (b) in the 2000 recommendations)

III.I The definition of locality in the 2000 recommendations

83. The 2000 recommendations included the following definition of locality (para. 44):
“For census purposes, a locality is defined as a distinct population cluster, that is, the population living in neighboring buildings which either:

- (a) form a continuous built up area with a clearly recognizable street formation; or*
- (b) though not part of such a built up area, form a group to which a locally recognized place name is uniquely attached; or*
- (c) though not coming within either of the above two requirements constitute a group, none of which is separated from its nearest neighbour by more than 200 metres”*

It was also recommended that the population be classified by size of locality according to size-classes specified in para. 49 of the recommendations.

III.II Compliance with the recommended definition of locality in the 2000 round

84. In the 2000 round, the concept of locality was used by 32 out of 44 countries (73 per cent), but only 17 countries complied with the definition included in the recommendation. Among the 15 countries that used a different definition, the most frequent reasons for the deviations were: to meet users’ needs (10 countries), to allow comparability with previous censuses (10 countries), and to be consistent with other statistical surveys (6 countries). Only 17 countries (39 per cent of the total) compiled tables where the population was classified by size of the locality, and most of them used classifications which were different (at various extents) from the recommended classification.

III.III Concluding remarks on the topic “locality” and possible changes to the 2010 recommendations

85. The technical nature of this topic and the limited information collected through the ECE questionnaire do not allow formulating clear proposals on possible changes to this topic in the 2010 recommendations at this stage.

86. With regard to the classification of the population by size of the locality, the usefulness of this classification should be discussed, since apparently it is used by a very small number of countries.

IV URBAN AND RURAL AREAS (derived non-core topic (a) in the 2000 rec.)

IV.I The definition of urban and rural areas in the 2000 recommendations

87. For the purpose of distinguishing urban and rural areas (which was considered as a non-core topic), the 2000 recommendations indicated the locality as the most appropriate unit of classification, but countries had the possibility to use in alternative the smallest civil division, or even agglomeration of units smaller than minor civil divisions (paras. 50-53).

88. It was suggested to define urban areas as localities with a population of 2,000 or more, and rural areas as localities with a population of less than 2,000 and sparsely populated areas. However, countries had the possibility to consider defining urban areas in other ways (e.g. in terms of administrative boundaries, of built up areas, of the area for which certain services are provided, or in terms of functional areas).

IV.II National practices on the definition of rural and urban areas in the 2000 round

89. The large majority of countries (36 out of 44, that is 82 per cent) distinguished urban and rural areas in the 2000 round of censuses. The favourite unit of classification appeared to be the smallest civil/administrative unit, which was used in 17 countries, while 11 countries used the locality (as suggested by the recommendations) and 10 countries used other classification units, generally defined at the national level. In **France** and **Portugal**, both the locality and the smallest civil/administrative unit were used as classification units.

90. With regard to the population threshold or other criteria used to distinguish urban and rural areas, in 17 countries (basically in most countries in **Eastern Europe** and the **CIS**), urban and rural areas were defined by national laws or other legal or administrative acts passed by the Government, the Parliament or other public administrations.

91. Only six countries (**Austria, Czech Republic, France, Greece, Israel and Portugal**) defined, as suggested in the recommendations, urban areas as localities with a population of 2000 or more, and rural areas as localities with a population of less than 2,000 and sparsely populated areas. Four countries used a much lower threshold of 200 inhabitants (**Australia, Finland, Ireland and Norway**).

92. In the **United States**, the threshold adopted was higher: urban areas included the so-called “urbanized areas” (defined as a “densely settled territory that contain 50,000 or more people”) and “urban clusters” (defined as a “densely settled territory that has at least 2,500 people but fewer than 50,000 people”).

93. In **Canada**, urban areas were defined on the basis of a “*minimum population concentration of 1000 persons and a population density of at least 400 persons per square kilometre*”, and all territory outside urban areas was classified as rural.

94. Four countries (**Slovakia, Slovenia, Switzerland** and the **United Kingdom**) adopted more complex approaches where urban areas were defined on the basis of different criteria, including population size but also various spatial, economic, structural, functional and administrative characteristics.

95. The ECE questionnaire also collected information on other criteria possibly used to classify the population according to the characteristics of the basic territorial entity - be it locality or civil unit or other basic unit - as for example functional areas, labour market areas, etc. Different criteria were adopted in 15 countries to create classifications of this type, including for instance:

- **Albania:** areas with prevalence of industrial or agricultural activities.
- **Austria:** “urban regions” or interconnection between localities through commuting.
- **Canada:** Census Metropolitan Area and Census Agglomeration Influenced Zones (MIZ). Municipalities that were not included in either a census metropolitan area (CMA) or a census agglomeration (CA) were classified into one of four categories (from “strong MIZ” to “no MIZ”) depending on the percentage of the residents who commute to work in the urban core of any census metropolitan area or census agglomeration.
- **Finland and Italy:** Labour market areas - if 10 or more % of labour the force is commuting to the main municipality (in Finland).

IV.III Concluding remarks on the topic “urban and rural areas” and possible changes to the 2010 recommendations

96. As this was a “non core topic” in 2000, the recommendations were quite “weak” and countries were presented with a relatively broad choice of approaches, in addition to the “suggested” approach.

97. The result is that while most countries in the ECE region distinguished urban and rural areas, only a very small number of countries followed the approach suggested in the recommendations. Moreover, in almost half of the countries urban and rural areas were defined at the national or local level by legal or administrative acts. As a consequence, the international comparability of data on urban and rural areas from the 2000 round of censuses is unfortunately very poor.

98. Given this situation, the opportunity of “strengthening” the recommendations on this topic for the 2010 round of censuses could be discussed, with the objective of improve the international comparability of data on urban and rural areas. However, given the technical nature of this topic, it would be advisable to receive the opinion of experts in this field.
