

## Farm structure (ef)

National Reference Metadata in ESS Standard for Quality Reports Structure (ESQRS)

Compiling agency: Please provide the name of the organisation of the contact points for the data or metadata. Czech Statistical Office

Time Dimension: 2013-A0

Data Provider: CZ1

Data Flow: FSS\_ESQRS\_A:1.0



### Eurostat metadata

#### Reference metadata

- [1. Contact](#)
- [2. Introduction](#)
- [3. Quality management - assessment](#)
- [4. Relevance](#)
- [5. Accuracy and reliability](#)
- [6. Timeliness and punctuality](#)
- [7. Accessibility and clarity](#)
- [8. Comparability](#)
- [9. Coherence](#)
- [10. Cost and Burden](#)
- [11. Confidentiality](#)
- [12. Statistical processing](#)
- [13. Comment](#)
- [Related Metadata](#)
- [Annexes \(including footnotes\)](#)

For any question on data and metadata, please contact: [EUROPEAN STATISTICAL DATA SUPPORT](#)[Download](#)

### 1. Contact Top

<b>1.1. Contact organisation</b>	<i>Please provide the name of the organisation of the contact points for the data or metadata.</i> Czech Statistical Office
<b>1.2. Contact organisation unit</b>	<i>Please specify an addressable subdivision of an organisation.</i> Agricultural, Forestry and Environmental Statistics Department
<b>1.5. Contact mail address</b>	<i>Please specify the postal address of the contact points for the data or metadata.</i> Czech Statistical Office Agricultural, Forestry and Environmental Statistics Department Na padesátém 81 100 82 Praha 10

### 2. Introduction Top

#### 2.a. Brief description of the national history of Farm Structure Surveys (FSS)

*This item is of special interest for countries with less experience in FSS surveys. In these cases it is useful to include a brief description about the related statistical activities e.g. establishment/update of the statistical register, etc. Please keep the description **brief** (expected length of maximum 250 words)*

The Farm Structure Survey 2013 was conducted during autumn 2013 as a sample survey. It was focused on obtaining detailed and complex information on the whole scale of the Czech agriculture, i.e. about the size and structure of agricultural holdings, about their equipment, specialisation of their production and other gainful activities. Its results are used in classification of agricultural holdings by their production orientation, economic size and importance of other gainful activities. The survey also serves as data source for update of the Farm Register, which is a basis for all yearly surveys in agriculture.

The Farm Structure Survey 2013 was preceded by the following surveys organized in line with the EU legislation: full surveys Agrocensus 2010 (= FSS & SAPM 2010) and Agrocensus 2000; and sample surveys FSS 2007, FSS 2005 and FSS 2003. The first survey of this nature conducted in the Czech Republic was Agrocensus 1995. It was focused on description of deep structural changes in the Czech agriculture due to fundamental economical transformation which followed the change of the political orientation in 1989.

Former Czechoslovakia provided FAO with data from regular exhaustive surveys in the frame of the world censuses of agriculture in 1970, 1980, 1990; no special surveys were organized during this period. In 1930 a census of agricultural works was conducted as a part of world agricultural census coordinated by the International Institute of Agriculture in Rome.

#### 2.b. Brief description of the national legislation of FSS

*Please **briefly** specify the following provisions from the national legislation:*

- the reference of the national legal base of the FSS survey (Act, Government Decree, etc.)	Act No. 89/1995 Coll., on the State Statistical Service, as amended.
- the scope and the coverage of the survey	No national legislation
- the frequency and the reference period of the survey	No national legislation
- the responsibility for the survey	No national legislation

- the administrative and financial provisions	Administrative provisions: Programme for Statistical Surveys for the year 2013 (Decree No 343/2012 Coll.), published in the Collection of Laws of the Czech Republic, chapter 127 (Decree No 317/2013 Coll. amending Decree No 343/2012 on Programme for Statistical Surveys was published on 9 October 2013). Financial provisions: no national legislation
- the obligations of the respondents with respect to the survey	Act No 89/1995 Coll., par. 10, point 3: Reporting Units are subject to Reporting Duty for the Statistical Surveys included in the Programme of Statistical Surveys.
- the identification, protection and obligations of survey enumerators	Act No 89/1995 Coll., par. 13: Agricultural censuses <sup>*)</sup> are conducted by the Czech Statistical Office or by the Ministry of Agriculture in co-operation with municipalities. Municipalities ensure data collection, using questionnaires received from the authority carrying out the census; this authority reimburses related expenses incurred by the municipalities. Persons authorised by the municipality to conduct agricultural censuses are entitled to become familiar with confidential statistical data they need to perform their work; they shall not make these data public or communicate them to anyone but employees of the authority conducting the agricultural census.  <sup>*)</sup> In the Czech Republic the term "agricultural censuses" is traditionally used not only for exhaustive surveys but also for particular sample surveys including FSS.
- the right of access to administrative data	Act No 89/1995 Coll., par. 9: Authorities performing the State Statistical Service use data acquired or collected by Ministries and other administrative authorities under special Acts. Ministries and other administrative authorities are bound to provide them with the necessary data on their request on time and free of charge unless otherwise stated by this Act.
- confidentiality provisions	Act No 89/1995 Coll., par. 16: Employees of authorities carrying out the State Statistical Service or persons processing Statistical Surveys or collecting data for Agricultural Censuses shall be subject to secrecy of confidential data they have knowledge of. To this end, they must be sworn to secrecy upon entering their employment or before they start the relevant work.

### 3. Quality management - assessment

[Top](#)

[Not requested]

### 4. Relevance

[Top](#)

#### 4.1. Relevance - User Needs

##### 4.1.a Overview of the main groups of national characteristics

Please indicate the main groups of national characteristics which are surveyed.

Please include references to characteristics surveyed only for national purposes and mention for which purposes and where the request came from (i.e. which are the users).

##### Main groups of characteristics collected for national purposes only:

Group of national characteristics collected	Purpose of collection	Requested by
Detailed breakdown of machinery and equipment	Computation of energy statistics and energy accounts (Environmental Accounts)	Research Institute of Agricultural technology
Processed amount of own products, providing services (CZK thous.)	Compilation of Economic Accounts for Agriculture	NSI
Own consumption (self-consumption of own products)	Compilation of Economic Accounts for Agriculture	NSI

##### 4.1.b Reference periods/dates of the main groups of national characteristics

Please indicate the reference periods/dates of the main groups of national characteristics. *(new)* Please provide justifications if the reference periods/dates from the Regulation 1166/2008 are not respected.

**Labour force variables:** 1 October 2012 – 30 September 2013

**Land use variables:** 1 October 2012 – 30 September 2013<sup>\*)</sup>

**Livestock variables:** 30 September 2013<sup>\*)</sup>

**Support for rural development variables:** last three years (2011 – 2013)

<sup>\*)</sup> The approach used in FSS & SAPM 2010 for Land use and Livestock variables, i. e. utilisation of data from annual statistical surveys in order to reduce the respondents' burden, was not employed in FSS 2013.

#### 4.2. Relevance - User Satisfaction

[Not requested]

#### 4.3. Completeness

Characteristics not collected (non-significant, non-existent or *(new)* possibly not collected for other reasons)

For non-significant or non-existent characteristics, you may repeat the information sent to Eurostat according to art. 7 par. 3 of Regulation 1166/2008. You can also attach the relevant file to this section using the "Add file" button below.

The overall answer to this item should provide information on:

-the list of characteristics non-significant and the list of characteristics non-existent from the EU list of characteristics [\[1\]](#);

-the reasons i.e. the prevalence or physical thresholds;

-the source(s) of information used (for the prevalence or physical thresholds);

- (new) how are non-significant or non-existent characteristics marked in the dataset transmitted to Eurostat.

(new) In addition, please specify whether non-significant characteristics are reported under the headings of other characteristics (as in the case of some countries). If yes, please specify which those other characteristics are and please indicate if the Standard Output of those other characteristics is recalculated considering the inclusion of the non-significant characteristics.

#### Non-significant characteristics

– not surveyed in FSS & SAPM 2010; the table shows the last data available.

Code	Crop	% of UAA			% of total area			% specific crop's output		
		FSS 2003	FSS 2005	FSS 2007	FSS 2003	FSS 2005	FSS 2007	EAA 2003	EAA 2005	EAA 2007
B_1_1_2	Durum wheat	0.0122	:	:	0.0084	:	:	NA	NA	NA
B_1_6_10	Hemp	0.0004	0.0030	:	0.0003	:	:	NA	NA	NA
B_1_7_1_2	Fresh vegetables, melons and strawberries - market gardening	:	0.0148	0.0095	:	0.0103	0.0067	NA	NA	NA
B_1_7_2	Fresh vegetables, melons and strawberries - under glass	0.0062	0.0021	0.0024	0.0043	0.0014	0.0017	NA	NA	NA
B_1_8_2	Flowers and ornamental plants - under glass	0.0018	0.0031	0.0029	0.0012	0.0022	0.0021	NA	NA	NA
B_4_1_3	Fruit and berry plantations - nuts	0.0013	0.0013	:	0.0009	0.0009	:	NA	0.0001	NA

(: not surveyed; NA not available)

#### Not existed characteristics

A_3_1_3	Agricultural area utilised for shared farming or other modes
A_3_2_3_9	Organic farming - citrus fruit
A_3_2_3_10	Organic farming - olives
B_1_1_7	Rice
B_1_6_1	Tobacco
B_1_6_3	Cotton
B_1_6_11	Other textile crops
B_4_1_1_2	Fruit species of subtropical climate zones
B_4_2	Citrus plantations
B_4_3	Olive plantations - total
B_4_3_1	Olive plantations - table olives
B_4_3_2	Olive plantations - oil production
B_4_4_4	Vineyards - raisins
B_4_7	Permanent crops under glass

#### Not collected for other reasons:

B_6_3_1	Energy crops on set-aside area
---------	--------------------------------

Handbook on implementing the FSS and SAPM definitions, Rev. 10, states:

Note to the variable (p. 41): No area is finally to be recorded here.

Explanations to the set-aside area (p. 30-31): The set-aside is not anymore obliged since Council Regulation (EC) No 1107/2007 for the crop year 2007/2008 and was definitely repealed by Council Regulation 73/2009.

Marking of NS and NE characteristics in the dataset transmitted to Eurostat:

":" for non-significant; "0" for non-existent

B\_1\_6\_10 Hemp can be included in B\_1\_6\_99 Other industrial crops not mentioned elsewhere.

B\_1\_7\_1\_2 Fresh vegetables, melons, strawberries – outdoor – market gardening and B\_1\_7\_2 Fresh vegetables, melons, strawberries - under glass are included in B\_1\_7 Fresh vegetables, melons, strawberries; and in B\_1\_7\_1 Fresh vegetables, melons, strawberries - outdoor.

The share of non-significant characteristics in other characteristics is not known; the Standard Output cannot be recalculated.

[\[1\]](#) See Annex III of Regulation (EC) 1166/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council on farm structure surveys and the survey on agricultural production methods and repealing Council Regulation (EEC) 571/88.

[Non-significant and non-existent characteristics](#)**4.3.1. Data completeness - rate**

[Not requested]

**5. Accuracy and reliability**[Top](#)

-

**5.1. Accuracy - overall****Main sources of error**

Please provide a **brief** general assessment on the main sources of error (e.g. sampling errors, measurement errors etc.)

No assesment was conducted; particular types of error are described in points 5.2 and 5.3.

**5.2. Sampling error**

*Section 5.2 should be completed only in case of sample surveys.*

**5.2.a. Applicability of precision requirements (precision criteria)**

The precision requirements stipulated in Annex IV "Precision Requirements" of the Regulation 1166/2008 are applicable only in some cases, depending on the actual value of characteristics. Thus, we are first interested to know the actual value of characteristics, in order to determine the applicability of precision requirements.

Please provide the actual values of the characteristics in a separate Excel file (template provided by Eurostat) and annex the completed file using the "Add file" button below. Here, we are interested in the point estimates (the weighted values), NOT in the relative standard errors (RSEs).

**5.2.b. Method used for estimation of relative standard errors (RSEs)**

Please describe the method used for estimation of RSEs. You can annex a document with the description of method and formulae applied, using the "Add file" button.

See the annexed file

**Annexes:**[RSE calculation method](#)[Precision requirements applicability](#)**5.2.1. Sampling error - indicators****5.2.1.a Relative standard errors (RSEs)**

*(new - the information request is not new, but only the template)* Please provide the RSEs in a separate Excel file (template provided by Eurostat) and annex the completed file using the "Add file" button below. The Excel file comprises tables related to the precision requirements stipulated in Annex IV "Precision Requirements" of the Regulation 1166/2008.

**5.2.1.b. (new) Reasons for possible cases where precision requirements are applicable and estimated RSEs are above the thresholds**

The cases where precision requirements are applicable are identified with the information provided in section 5.2.a. For those cases, the requirement is that the estimated RSEs are below the thresholds stipulated in Annex IV "Precision Requirements" of the Regulation 1166/2008. However, in some of these cases, estimated RSEs might be above the thresholds. In the latter cases, please provide justifications.

All characteristics for which the levels of precision are presented in the annex Relative standard errors reached threshold levels (< 5%) with the only exception B\_1\_8 Flowers and ornamental plants. In this case conditions for application of precision requirements at the NUTS1 level were not met as this characteristic did not reach the required prevalence (7.5% of UAA or more).

**Annexes:**[Relative standard errors](#)**5.3. Non-sampling error**

*Section 5.3 should be completed only in case of a sample survey or a census.*

*Section 5.3 should not be completed when data are entirely taken from administrative sources. In this case, section 12.1.e.5 of the report provides the relevant information.*

**Assessment of possible bias**

If comparison with another source or consistency study is made, please give a **brief** description of the source used and the differences observed which can be proof of bias. *(new)* Please also consider here bias risks associated with non-response by assessing the distribution of non-response across holdings' categories.

No comparison with another source or consistency study was conducted. Since the non-response rate is very small (2.21%) the non-response bias is expected to be negligible.

**5.3.1. Coverage error****5.3.1.a Under-coverage errors**

Under-coverage units are target population units that are not accessible via the frame. This mainly includes new units not included in the frame, either through real birth or demergers, and wrongly classified units. This generally leads to bias in the estimates. If possible, please provide an assessment on the extent of under-coverage.

During the survey, in total 60 newly established agricultural holdings were found. Such holdings were not involved in the sample (i.e. they were not recorded in the Farm Register) but they were surveyed as they belonged to the target population. In the grossing-up procedure weight=1 was assigned to each of these holdings.

**5.3.1.b Over-coverage**

Over-coverage units are units that do not belong to the target population. Please mention whether the data was corrected for over-coverage and if yes, please describe.

According to the FSS 2013 results, in total 756 agricultural holdings do not belong to the target population as they either do not reach the threshold levels for the survey or have ceased or temporarily stopped their agricultural activity.

**5.3.1.c Misclassification errors**

*Misclassification refers to wrongly classified units (for example by geographical area or size) which belong to the target population. Please provide an assessment on the extent of misclassification errors and how they were addressed.*

No misclassification errors were recorded.

During calculation of relative standard errors 27 units showing extreme values were identified; their weight was changed to 1 and the units were moved to 100% stratum.

**5.3.1.d Contact errors**

*They refer to units with incomplete or incorrect contact data. Please describe how possible errors were corrected.*

In exceptional cases the correct address of the agricultural holding was not available due to moving of the holding.

These holdings were included in the population on the basis of their last available address. The CZSO staff made attempts to find new addresses using e.g. the Business Register, LPIS, information from local authorities etc. but not always successfully. Such holdings were classified as ineligible.

**5.3.1.e Multiple listings**

*Multiple listings are units which are present more than once in the frame. Please indicate the proportion of multiple listings in the frame which are present more than once in the frame and specify how the duplicates were eliminated.*

No multiple listing occurred.

**5.3.1.f Other relevant information, if any**

-

**5.3.1.1. Over-coverage - rate**

*Please provide the value of the over-coverage rate.*

*The over-coverage rate is the proportion of units accessible via the frame which do not belong to the target population (e.g. holdings with ceased activities still included in the frame).*

6.33% (= 756/11 942\*100)

**5.3.2. Measurement error****5.3.2.a Causes of measurement errors in the FSS survey**

*The causes are commonly categorised as:*

- *Survey instrument: the form, questionnaire or measuring device used for data collection may lead to the recording of wrong values;*
- *Respondent: respondents may, consciously or unconsciously, give erroneous data;*
- *Interviewer: interviewers may influence the answers given by respondents.*

*Please include here possible problems caused by difficult questions, unclear definitions, sensitive questions etc. which are likely to determine measurement errors.*

The questionnaire used in FSS 2013 was very similar to ones used in previous FSS's so the risk that the respondents did not correctly understand the questions was minimised.

**5.3.2.b If available, failure rates during data editing. Please mention if the data was corrected.**

Not available

**5.3.2.c If available, assessments based on comparisons with external data, re-interviews, etc.**

Not available

**5.3.3. Non response error****5.3.3.a (new) Unit non-response: reasons and treatment**

*Please specify the reasons for unit non-response and how the unit non-response was accounted for. Unit non-response can be accounted for by e.g. re-weighting, imputation.*

The most common reason was overall refusal to fill-in the questionnaire. These events could not have been influenced by the way of delivery of the questionnaire – in such cases even personal interviews were unsuccessful.

The data for non-responding holdings were imputed using two ways:

- (i) Holdings with high similarity in the frame of their strata: average values for each stratum;
- (ii) Holdings with extreme values: the last data available (i.e. from FSS 2010).

**5.3.3.b Item non-response: reasons and treatment**

*Please mention any characteristic(s) having higher item non-response rate together with the reasons of the item non-response. This information is important and will be useful for the organisation of future surveys. Please also specify how the item non-response was accounted for. Item non-response can be accounted for by e.g. re-weighting, imputation.*

Item non-response almost did not occur during the field work in the FSS 2013. The questionnaire contained a large proportion of variables already surveyed (in FSS 2010 and in some cases even in preceding Farm Structure Surveys) and, therefore, in most cases well known to the respondents.

In case of missing data the responding unit was contacted again and the data was filled in.

**5.3.3.1. Unit non-response - rate**

*Please provide the ratio of the number of non-responding holdings with no information or not usable information (item 5.1, table in section 12.3.d) to the total number of in-scope (eligible) units (item 5, table in section 12.3.d).*

2.21% (=247/11 186\*100)

**5.3.3.2. Item non-response - rate**

*Please provide the ratio of the in-scope (eligible) units which have not responded to a particular item (characteristic) to the in-scope (eligible) units that are required to respond to that particular item (characteristic). Please provide this rate for characteristics with high item non-response.*

unidentifiable (not recorded) → the final item non-response rate is 0.0

**5.3.4. Processing error****5.3.4.a Assessment of processing errors affecting individual observations**

*Please give a quantitative or qualitative assessment of processing errors.*

No assesment was conducted.

**5.3.4.b Completion/correction methods applied**

*These can consist of follow-up interviews, imputation, re-weighting, use of other data sources etc. Please describe.*

Typing etc. errors may have occurred during data recording but the risk was minimised by using check rules.

In case of any imperfections in the data (e.g. missing data, item non-response) the respondents were contacted by phone and their data were completed. There was no reason to use imputation techniques for missing data.

Corrections of processed data were made by the Agricultural, Forestry and Environmental Statistics Dept. as experts on survey methodology or by the Unit for Processing of Agricultural and Forestry Indicators in Kind (after their consultation with the Agricultural, Forestry and Environmental Statistics Dept.).

**5.3.4.c Imputation methods**

*Please specify what kind of imputation methods were used and for which items (characteristics).*

Data imputation was conducted for agricultural holdings which did not fill in their questionnaires. The last available data (from the FSS 2010) or average values for particular sampling strata were used for the imputation.

**5.3.4.d Tools used and people/organisations authorised to make corrections**

The Czech Statistical Office; staff of Field Surveys Units, the Unit for Processing of Agricultural and Forestry Indicators in Kind, and the Agricultural, Forestry and Environmental Statistics Dept.

Tools used: Dataman Windows, Microsoft Visual FoxPro

**5.3.4.1. Imputation - rate**

*Please provide the ratio of the number of replaced values to the total number of values for a given characteristic, for each main characteristic where this method was applied.*

Data for 247 non-responding units were imputed; i.e. the ratio = 2.09% for all main characteristics

**5.3.4.2. Common units - proportion**

[Not requested]

**5.3.5. Model assumption error**

In case of models used for estimation, please provide an estimation of related errors.

No models were used.

**5.3.6. Data revision**

N/A

**5.3.6.1. Data revision - policy****Brief description of the revision policy**

No planned revisions of the FSS data are conducted as the data is checked sufficiently during their processing (validation rules, comparison with other surveys). However, unplanned data revision could occur.

**5.3.6.2. Data revision - practice****Data revision practice**

*Please describe the practice, provide the main reasons for revisions and the extent to which the revisions improved accuracy.*

*Please provide the average number of revisions (planned and unplanned) for main characteristics.*

No revision of FSS 2013 data was done since their dissemination until finishing the NMR. Data from FSS 2000 (recalculated using threshold values for FSS 2013) were used for comparison of trends in the period 2000–2013.

**5.3.6.3. Data revision - average size**

[Not requested]

**5.3.7. Seasonal adjustment**

[Not requested]

**6. Timeliness and punctuality**

[Top](#)

-

**6.1. Timeliness**

See below

**6.1.1. Time lag - first result**

*Please indicate the number of months from the last day of the reference period to the day of publication of first results.*

Last day of the reference period: 30 September 2013

Day of the first publication of results: 29 August 2014

Time lag = 11 months from the last day of reference period.

**6.1.2. Time lag - final result**

*Please indicate the number of months from the last day of the reference period to the day of publication of complete and final results.*

First results = final results; i.e. time lag = 11 months (see point 6.1.1)

**6.2. Punctuality**

See below

**6.2.1. Punctuality - delivery and publication**

*Please indicate the number of days between the delivery/ release date of data and the target date on which they were scheduled for delivery/ release.*

4 days (target date: 2 September 2014)

**7. Accessibility and clarity**

[Top](#)

-
<b>7.1. Dissemination format - News release</b>
[Not requested]
<b>7.2. Dissemination format - Publications</b>
<b>Regular and ad-hoc publications in which data are made available to the public</b>
<b>7.2.a The nature of publications</b> Please specify the nature of publications. For example, the publications can contain preliminary results or final results, can be technical reports, etc. Please also specify if the publications contain metadata.
The CZSO disseminates only final results, no preliminary ones are published. The publications are usually available in both paper version and electronic form at the website of the Czech Statistical Office ( <a href="http://www.czso.cz">www.czso.cz</a> ). All publications are bilingual (Czech and English) and they are gratis (paid from a grant budget). <b>Farm structure survey 2013:</b> output tables for the whole agricultural sector and for selected types of legal forms, basic information on the survey, methodological notes. <b>Farm structure survey 2013 in regions:</b> basic information for regions (NUTS2) for the whole agricultural sector and by two main legal forms, methodological notes (only electronic version available). <b>Farm structure survey 2013 – analysis:</b> farm typology, regional results, comparison of results for FSS 2013 and FSS 2000 (co-author: Institute of Agricultural Economics and Information).
<b>7.2.b Date of issuing (actual or planned)</b>
On 29 August 2014, press conference focused on the FSS 2013 results was held in the framework of the international agricultural fair “Země Živitelka” in České Budějovice. Final results of the survey were presented there and the publication “Farm Structure Survey 2013” was introduced. Farm structure survey 2013: 29 August 2014 Farm structure survey 2013 in regions: 19 December 2014 Farm structure survey 2013 – analytical evaluation: 16 March 2015
<b>7.2.c References for on-line publications.</b>
Farm structure survey 2013: <a href="https://www.czso.cz/csu/czso/farm-structure-survey-2013">https://www.czso.cz/csu/czso/farm-structure-survey-2013</a> Farm structure survey 2013 in regions: <a href="https://www.czso.cz/csu/czso/farm-structure-survey-regions-2013-676t9wjj4i">https://www.czso.cz/csu/czso/farm-structure-survey-regions-2013-676t9wjj4i</a> Farm structure survey 2013 – analytical evaluation: <a href="https://www.czso.cz/csu/czso/farm-structure-survey-analytical-evaluation-2013">https://www.czso.cz/csu/czso/farm-structure-survey-analytical-evaluation-2013</a>
<b>7.3. Dissemination format - online database</b>
Please provide information about on-line databases in which the disseminated data can be accessed.
The FSS results are not available in on-line public database.
<b>7.3.1. Data tables - consultations</b>
<b>The number of consultations of on-line data tables for a given time period</b>
Please indicate on-line data tables with an indicative number of consultations.
Not applicable (see point 7.3)
<b>7.4. Dissemination format - microdata access</b>
[Not requested]
<b>7.5. Documentation on methodology</b>
<b>7.5.a Available documentation on methodology on FSS national survey</b> Please provide references.
Eurostat, 2012: CPSA/SB/652 Rev. 10: Handbook on implementing the FSS and SAPM definitions. Luxembourg
<b>7.5.b Main scientific references</b> Please provide references.
No scientific references were used.
<b>7.5.1. Metadata completeness - rate</b>
[Not requested]
<b>7.5.2. Metadata - consultations</b>
[Not requested]
<b>7.6. Quality management - documentation</b>
<b>Available documentation on quality</b> Please provide references.
Quality documentation was not elaborated.
<b>7.7. Dissemination format - other</b>
[Not requested]

## 8. Comparability

[Top](#)

-
<b>8.1. Comparability - geographical</b>
<b>8.1.a National vs. EU definition of a holding</b>
Please indicate possible differences between the national definition and the EU definition of the holding <a href="#">[2]</a> . Please also indicate the reasons.

No difference between the national definition and the EU definition of the holding.

#### 8.1.b National survey coverage vs. coverage of the records sent to Eurostat

Please indicate possible differences between the population covered in the national survey and the population covered by the records sent to Eurostat. Please also specify the reasons.  
The population covered in the national survey may be different from the population covered by the records which are sent to Eurostat, in case very low national thresholds are applied or no national thresholds are applied.

No differences between the population in the national survey and in the records sent to Eurostat

The threshold was set up at such level, that only small agricultural holdings representing up to 2% of utilised agricultural area and up to 2% of livestock units[1] were excluded (see Article 3.2 of the Regulation No 1166/2008).

[1] Livestock unit means a standard measurement unit that allows the aggregation of the various categories of livestock in order to enable them to be compared. 1 Livestock unit represents 500 kg of live weight of an animal.

#### 8.1.c National vs. EU definitions of characteristics

Please indicate the version of the Handbook on implementing the FSS definitions used for the organisation of the current FSS survey.

Please indicate possible differences between national and EU definitions of characteristics and classifications of characteristics, the differences, the reasons and the impact on the comparability with the EU definitions. This information is relevant for users.

Please also indicate the number of hours per year for a full-time employee, used to calculate the Annual Work Unit.

Handbook version: CPSA/SB/652 Rev. 10

- EU definition: hops [B\_1\_6\_2] is included in crops grown on arable land;
- National definition: hop-gardens are reported as permanent crops according to the Law No 252/1997 Coll., on agriculture, as amended.

Data on total arable area and permanent crops in Eurostat database differ from the data published on the national level. Data on total utilised agricultural area (permanent crops + plus arable land) are the same.

- EU definition: nurseries [B\_4\_5] are included in permanent crops;
- National definition: nurseries are reported as crops grown on arable land.

Data in Eurostat database differ from the data published on the national level likewise.

- EU definition: trees and bushes grown for use for energy production only [B\_6\_3] are included in wooded area (of which short rotation coppices);
- National definition: they are included either in other industrial crops or in other permanent crops (of which short rotation coppices).

Therefore in the Eurofarm database total utilised agricultural area is lower and wooded area is higher than in national data.

- EU definition: in the frame of organic farming, temporary grasslands are included in permanent grasslands;
- National definition: they are included in plants harvested green on arable land (perennial green fodder).

Number of hours per year for a full-time employee for AWU calculation: 1 800

#### 8.1.d Common land

The legal change of the utilised agricultural area concept, and also the fact that there are various options for the coverage of the common land make this an obligatory section in this report for all countries.

##### 8.1.d.1 Current methodology for collecting information on the common land

If common land does not exist in the country, please specify this.

If common land exists and you do not collect information on common land, please specify this and the reasons.

If you collect information on common land, please describe the methodology by referring to the below options. Combinations of the options are possible; if you use more options, please briefly describe each one.

- common land is included in the land use data of the agricultural holdings making use of the common land.

- common land is included as special holdings i.e. the common land holdings. In addition to records with data representing agricultural holdings, records representing the common land holdings are created.

- common land is collected at regional level and included in regional records. In addition to records with data representing agricultural holdings, records representing the regional sum of the common land are created. According to discussion in a Working Group, this third option has been converted into the second option (common land holdings) allowing all common land to be formatted and included in the Eurofarm tables.

In addition, please specify:

- whether there was a set of specific questions in the FSS questionnaire on common land or a separate questionnaire. In the case of a separate questionnaire, it should be attached to this report, section 12.3.e.
- (new) how was the common land treated in terms of tenure classification;
- (new) how can common land be identified in the data.

Common land does not exist in the Czech Republic

##### 8.1.d.2 Possible problems encountered in relation to the collection of information on common land and possible solutions for future FSS surveys

Please provide this information in case information on common land is collected.

Not applicable

##### 8.1.d.3 Total area of common land surveyed in the reference year

Please indicate the survey estimate in case information on common land is collected.

Not applicable

##### 8.1.d.4 (new) Number of agricultural holdings making use of the common land or Number of (specially created) common land holdings in the reference year

Please indicate this number in case information on common land is collected.

Not applicable

#### 8.1.e. Location of the holding

##### 8.1.e.1 The origin of the coordinates

Please specify from which source you have obtained the origin of the coordinates (the geographical reference of the holding). This is required in the Handbook (document 3.1. Methodology - Handbook on implementing the FSS and SAPM definitions - REV 10). For example: cadastre information system, IACS (Integrated Administrative Control System), CAPI (Computer Assisted Personal Interview) with digital maps, address register (address of the farm or of the farmer), LAU2 (village, town, municipality etc.) region of the farm.

Address register: Register of Enumeration Districts and Buildings as at 1.10.2014

##### 8.1.e.2 (new) The reference system



Eurostat asks to transmit the coordinates based on the reference system ETRS89 (European Terrestrial Reference system 1989) but has set up his system to allow coordinate transformation from different reference systems. Please specify the reference system used in countries to store data on location of the agricultural holdings. This information is required by the Handbook (document 3.1. Methodology - Handbook on implementing the FSS and SAPM definitions - REV 10).

ETRS89 – SRID 4258

#### 8.1.e.3 (new) The rounding of the coordinates

Eurostat recommends the transmission of the exact coordinates (the data is handled respecting statistical confidentiality provisions).

If countries still round the coordinates to a grid system, Eurostat recommends the grid based on the INSPIRE data specification on Coordinate Reference System.

Please specify if you transmit the exact coordinates or if you round them. If in the last case, please briefly describe the rounding method and the level of the rounding. For example: LAU2, regions lower than LAU2, census enumeration areas, grids, grouping by 5 holdings (ranked by latitude and longitude).

Rounded coordinates transmitted.

Combination of 5x5 min space grid and LAU2 polygons used for rounding.

#### 8.1.e.4 (new) The criteria used to determine the NUTS3 region of the holding

Please indicate which criterion is used to determine the NUTS3 region of the holding. Criteria:

- the majority of the total area of the holding where the holding is located;
- the building (administrative, for livestock or other production);
- the most important parcel (in terms of production);
- the residence of the farmer (if it is not further than 5 km from the farm).

(i) holding's headquarter = place of its agricultural production: the headquarter address (9 379 holdings);

(ii) holding's headquarter ≠ place of its agricultural production: the Territorial Technical Unit<sup>[1]</sup> where the largest parcel is placed (1 807 holdings).

[1] A Territorial Technical Unit is a unit defined as cadastral territory or part of cadastral territory separated by the border of a basic settlement unit, i.e. by the border of a municipality, city district or city part. A municipality (LAU2) consists of one or more Territorial Technical Units.

#### 8.1.f (new) Organic farming

Possible differences between national standards and rules for certification of organic products and the ones set out in Council Regulation No.834/2007

Please mention possible differences. This information is requested by the handbook (document 3.1. Methodology - Handbook on implementing the FSS and SAPM definitions - REV 10).

No differences between national standards and rules set out in Reg. No. 834/2007

[2] See Article 2 of Regulation (EC) 1166/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council on farm structure surveys and the survey on agricultural production methods and repealing Council Regulation (EEC) 571/88

#### 8.1.1. Asymmetry for mirror flow statistics - coefficient

[Not requested]

### 8.2. Comparability - over time

#### 8.2.a Possible changes of the definition of the holding<, the reasons and the impact of the changes on the comparability with previous sample survey/census data

Please indicate the relevant case from the ones below:

- a. There have been no changes, in which case this should be reported.
  - b. There have been some changes but not enough to warrant the designation of a break in series.
  - c. There have been sufficient changes to warrant the designation of a break in series.
- In the second and third cases, please indicate the changes, the reasons and their impact on the comparability over time. Particularly in the third case, please indicate any information relevant for users.

a. There have been no changes, in which case this should be reported.

#### 8.2.b (new) Possible changes in the coverage of holdings for which records are sent to Eurostat, the reasons and the impact on the comparability with previous sample survey/census data processed by Eurostat

Please indicate the relevant case from the ones below:

- a. There have been no changes.
  - b. There have been some changes but not enough to warrant the designation of a break in series.
  - c. There have been sufficient changes to warrant the designation of a break in series.
- In the second and third cases, please indicate the changes, the reasons and their impact on the comparability over time. Particularly in the third case, please indicate which procedure Eurostat should apply to compare the data over years and any other information relevant for users.

#### b. There have been some changes but not enough to warrant the designation of a break in series:

In 2013 and 2010 higher threshold levels were applied than in 2007, 2005 and 2003.

In 2013 different methods of sample construction were used than in 2007, 2005 and 2003.

No changes in the coverage were introduced between 2010 and 2013.

#### 8.2.c Changes of definitions and/or reference time and/or measurements of characteristics the reasons and the impact of the changes on the comparability with previous sample survey/census data.

Please specify the characteristics whose definitions underwent changes, the reasons and the impact on the comparability over time.

Please indicate the relevant case from the ones below:

- a. There have been some changes but not enough to warrant the designation of a break in series.
  - b. There have been sufficient changes to warrant the designation of a break in series.
- Particularly in the second case, please indicate any information relevant for users.

#### 1) a. There have been some changes but not enough to warrant the designation of a break in series:

A\_3\_2\_1 The total utilised agricultural area of the holding on which organic farming production methods are applied and certified according to national or European Community rules

A\_3\_2\_2 The total utilised agricultural area of the holding that is under conversion to organic farming production methods to be certified according to national or European Community rules

FSS & SAPM 2010: including kitchen gardens.

FSS 2013: kitchen gardens were not included (Handbook CPSA/SB/652, rev. 10).

#### 2) b. There have been sufficient changes to warrant the designation of a break in series:

C\_5\_2 Laying hens and C\_5\_3 Other poultry

FSS & SAPM 2010: Pullets were included in Laying hens (Handbook CPSA/SB/652, rev. 6: „Growing pullets before point of lay are included if they have been stalled up as laying hens. Cull hens are also included. All hens which have started to lay are included, whether the eggs are for consumption or for breeding. Breeding cocks for laying hens are included“.)

FSS 2013: Pullets were included in Other poultry (Handbook CPSA/SB/652, rev. 10: “Poultry not mentioned under Broilers or Laying hens. Chicks are excluded“).

#### 8.2.d (new) Changes over time in the results as compared to previous sample survey/census, which may be attributed to sampling variability

This item is applicable when at least one of the two surveys whose results are compared is carried out as a sample survey.  
Please indicate any information relevant for users.

FSS & SAPM 2010: census

FSS 2013: sample survey

**Changes possibly attributed to sampling variability:** The sample was constructed using UAA and LSU (or particular livestock numbers) as stratification variables. During the grossing-up procedure emphasis was put on these variables; it means that for other variables the data may minutely differ from those that would be obtained in case of census.

#### 8.2.e Common Land

##### 8.2.e.1 Possible change in the decision or in the methodology to collect common land, compared with previous sample survey/census data and reasons.

Please specify possible changes and reasons.

Common land does not exist in the Czech Republic.

##### 8.2.e.2 Change of the total area of common land and of the number of agricultural holdings making use of the common land number of common land holdings compared with the previous sample survey/census data and possible reason(s)

<Please specify.

Not applicable

#### 8.2.f Major trends on the main characteristics compared with the previous sample survey/census data

Please complete the following table. Comments must be given in case there is a change of more than 10% in the current FSS survey compared with the previous one for any numeric main characteristic.  
This comparison concerns the population covered by the records sent to Eurostat.

		FSS 2010		Comments
Number of holdings	26 246	22 860	14.8	New holdings were established by merging of two or more holdings under the threshold level into one holding above the threshold level between 2010 and 2013. The number of holdings in FSS 2013 is influenced by grossing-up methodology (grossing-up strata are based on UAA and LSU).
UAA (A_3_1), ha	3 491 472	3 483 500	0.2	
Arable land, ha	2 492 109	2 517 490	-1.0	
Permanent grassland (B_3), ha	960 076	928 820	3.4	<
Permanent crops (B_4), ha	39 092	36 950	5.8	
Wooded area (B_5_2), ha	1 520 457	1 546 950	-1.7	
Unutilised Agricultural area (B_5_1), ha	6 187	2 540	143.6	Changes in the support policy. Includes area damaged by floods where crops were ploughed under afterwards. Generally, the farmers make efforts to minimise the fallow land area.
Fallow land (B_1_12_1 + B_1_12_2), ha	12 316	37 460	-67.1	
LSU in LSU	1 727 774	1 722 460	0.3	
Cattle (C_2), heads	1 368 813	1 328 930	3.0	
Family labour force, persons	49 420	42 970	15.0	Increased number of holdings of natural persons in 2013 → increased share of family labour in the total labour force.
Family labour force, AWU	27 072	24 040	12.6	In holdings of natural persons: replacement of non-family labour by family one (usually for part-time work).
Non family labour force, persons	82 709	89 760	-7.9	

Non family labour force, AWU	73 999	80 560	-8.1	
---------------------------------	--------	--------	------	--

**8.2.1. Length of comparable time series**

[Not requested]

**8.3. Comparability - domain****Comparisons with other data sources at micro/macro level**

Other data sources can be for example administrative data, crop production surveys, animal surveys, labour force surveys, National Accounts.  
If you run comparisons, please give a brief description of the results of these comparisons and possible adjustment made to FSS data. If not, please indicate why not.

**8.3.a Comparisons at micro level**

Not performed

**8.3.b Comparisons at macro level**

Comparison of FSS 2013 results with data from the "Areas under Crops Census as at 31 May 2013" survey:

Utilised agricultural area (ha)	Areas under Crops Census; 31 May 2013	FSS 2013; 30 September 2013	Differences +,-	Index FSS/Areas under Crops Census
<b>Utilised agricultural area, total</b>	<b>3 521 000</b>	<b>3 491 472</b>	<b>-29 528</b>	<b>&lt;99.2</b>
Arable land	2 504 927	2 492 109	-12 818	99.5
Hop-gardens	5 823	5 155	-668	88.5
Vineyards, total	16 787	14 852	-1 935	88.5
Kitchen gardens	1 196	195	-1 001	16.3
Orchards	22 687	21 011	-1 676	92.6
	973 711	960 076	-13 635	98.6

Arable land use (ha)	Areas under Crops Census; 31 May 2013	FSS 2013; 30 September 2013	Differences +,-	
<b>Arable land utilised, total</b>	<b>2 504 927</b>	<b>2 492 109</b>	<b>-12 818</b>	<b>&lt;99.5</b>
Cereals, total	1 413 143	1 428 930	15 787	101.1
Pulses for grain, total	17 851	17 869	18	100.1
Root crops, total	86 151	87 099	948	101.1
Industrial crops, total	500 738	489 835	-10 903	97.8
Oil crops	486 908	481 646	-5 262	98.9
Other industrial crops (chicory root, rumex)	2 067	2 555	488	123.6
Arable fodder crops, total	451 383	432 270	-19 113	95.8
Annual green fodder, total				
/td>	280 058	278 399	-1 659	99.4
Green maize	233 815	226 015	-7 800	96.7
Perennial fodder crops	171 325	153 870	-17 455	89.8
Vegetables, total	8 557	8 678	121	101.4
Strawberries, total	496	491	-5	99.0

Comparison of FSS 2013 results with data from the "Livestock Census as at 1 April 2013" survey:

Livestock (number of heads)	Livestock Census; 1 April 2013	FSS 2013; 30 September 2013	Differences +,-	Index FSS/Livestock Census (%)
<b>Cattle, total</b>	<b>1 352 822</b>	<b>1 368 813</b>	<b>15 991</b>	<b>101.2</b>
Cows, total				101.3
Dairy cows	367 327	369 976	2 649	100.7
Other cows	184 597	188 931	4 334	102.3

Pigs, total	1 586 627	1 574 399	-12 228	99.2
Sheep, total	220 521	199 376	-21 145	90.4
Goats, total	24 042	17 903	-6 139	74.5
Horses, total	34 281	26 496	-7 785	77.3
Donkeys and mules	298	208	-90	69.8
Poultry, total	23 265 358	25 344 798	2 079 440	108.9
Hens	7 242 723	7 084 617	-158 106	97.8
Chicken for breeding		2 987 043	-377 399	88.8
Chicken for fattening	11 693 242	13 989 880	2 296 638	119.6

## 9. Coherence

[Top](#)

### 9.1. Coherence - cross domain

#### (new) Coherence with other data sources

Please indicate whether the FSS statistics are reconcilable (i.e. can be combined) with those obtained through other data sources or statistical domains.

FSS 2013 data are not reconcilable with data from other domains.

#### 9.1.1 Coherence - sub annual and annual statistics

[Not requested]

#### 9.1.2. Coherence - National Accounts

[Not requested]

### 9.2. Coherence - internal

[Not requested]

## 10. Cost and Burden

[Top](#)

### Co-ordination with other surveys: burden on respondents

Please indicate if there is any co-ordination between surveys to avoid the situation that some farms have to answer multiple questionnaires with the same kind of questions.

No co-ordination between FSS and other surveys in 2013.

The attempt to coordinate FSS & SAPM 2010 with annual crop and livestock statistics was accompanied with methodological and technical problems and therefore this approach was not applied on FSS 2013.

## 11. Confidentiality

[Top](#)

The confidentiality is required by law. This report should confirm these arrangements.

Please provide the requested information, taking into consideration that this report is a non-confidential document.

### 11.1. Confidentiality - policy

#### Dissemination of micro-data to external users for research purposes

Please mention if micro-data are also disseminated and if yes, the confidentiality provisions that are applied.

External users are not allowed to access micro-data for research purposes; for such cases, the CZSO produces "tailor-made" aggregations.

### 11.2. Confidentiality - data treatment

#### The procedures applied for ensuring confidentiality of the data during dissemination

Procedures can include controlled rounding, cell suppression, aggregation of disclosive information, aggregation rules on aggregated confidential data, primary confidentiality with regard to single data values etc. Main reference: [Handbook on Statistical Disclosure Control \(2007\)](#).

The rules for providing data by the CZSO to third parties are based on national and EU legislation, especially on the Act No. 89/1995 Coll., on the State Statistical Service, as amended.

Data confidentiality during dissemination is ensured by internal directive of the CZSO which states that statistical information can be released in case it is produced as an aggregation of at least three subjects. Furthermore, sum of shares for the two greatest individual values cannot exceed 85 % of the total aggregation. In case of exceeding this value the data are treated as confidential. Aggregation on a superior level must be done or another solution must be applied. The data can be released or provided to a third party on a contractual basis if the dominant subject provides a written approval to the CZSO.

## 12. Statistical processing

[Top](#)

### Survey organisation and calendar

Please provide **brief** information on:

#### 12.a The steps of the survey organisation and the starting and ending time of each step.

This information could help countries in the future planning of the activities.

As guidelines, the steps can consist of the following. Please adapt to the national situation if needed.

#### Main phases of the survey:

1. Preparation, organisation, coordination, monitoring
2. Field survey
3. Processing of the data
4. Data validation and dissemination

As similar surveys were conducted in 2003, 2005, 2007 and 2010, there was no pilot survey organized in the frame of FSS 2013.

#### Timetable:

1. definition of survey objective and requirements:
  - 1.1. formation of workgroups for survey organisation;
  - 1.2. consultation of users;
  - 1.3. set-up objectives, target population, statistical units, classifications, precision requirements etc.;
  - 1.4. survey promotion.
2. survey design:
  - 2.1. set-up organisation of the survey (e.g. detailed timetable, specification of resources, costs estimation);
  - 2.2. definition of the survey variables;
  - 2.3. design of the sampling frame and sampling procedures;
  - 2.4. design of data collection procedures (e.g. questionnaire design, selection of data collection modes etc.);
  - 2.5. design of data processing procedures (e.g. CATI/CAPI/CAWI input programmes etc.);
  - 2.6. pilot survey organisation and execution.
3. data collection:
  - 3.1. sampling frame construction and sample selection;
  - 3.2. recruitment of interviewers;
  - 3.3. training of interviewers;
  - 3.4. fieldwork;
  - 3.5. evaluation and assessment of fieldwork.
4. data processing and validation:
  - 4.1. data entry and data coding;
  - 4.2. data validation (at record level);
  - 4.3. data correction and imputation.
5. data compilation:
  - 5.1. weight calculation and estimation;
  - 5.2. calculation of derived variables;
  - 5.3. calculation of quality indicators (e.g. non-response rates, relative standard errors, coverage errors, bias etc.);
  - 5.4. aggregation and tabulation;
  - 5.5. validation of aggregated data.
6. data analysis
7. data dissemination

**12.b The bodies involved and the split of responsibilities among bodies** with respect to the main steps of the survey process

**12.c Serious deviations (if any) from the established calendar and reasons.** Please mention only serious deviations with significant consequences on the quality and the transmission time of data to Eurostat.

- o September 2012:
  - **Signature of the project agreement**
- o October 2012 – May 2013:
  - Testing of questionnaires
  - Working out of leaflets and booklets for respondents and municipalities
  - Drafting of cover letters for municipal offices and respondents.
  - Drafting of contracts for work and contracts for services.
  - Printing of questionnaires with methodological notes
  - Development of population and sample, application of precision requirements
- o June 2013:
  - Staff preparation meetings
  - Training of staff of Field Surveys Units and
  - Working out of Minutes of the staff training meeting including explanatory notes and examples
  - Programming of enter data, checking, control tables
- o July – August 2013:
  - Training of interviewers at regional offices
  - Providing methodological service
- o September – November 2013:
  - **Field work**, collecting questionnaires, data checks
  - Providing methodological service
- December 2013:
  - Finalisation of field work
  - Staff meeting (information on the course of the survey)
  - Working out of a connector between the questionnaire structure and Eurofarm structure
  - Pay-out of the interviewers
- January - February 2014:
  - Finalisation of questionnaires' recordingmistake corrections, check runs
  - Reinvestigation of missing data at regional offices
- March – August 2014:
  - Programming of outputs tables
  - Compiling a programme for conversion of data in Eurofarm format
  - Data validation and verification
  - Asking for administrative data
- 29 August 2014: Data dissemination (press conference, electronical and printed publications)
- September – November 2014:
  - SO coefficients calculation
- December 2014:
  - Generating of geographical coordinates
  - Working out of National Methodological Report
- December 2014:
  - **Transmission of microdata and NMR to Eurostat**
- Beginning of 2015:
  - Final technical implementation report and financial statement

**Czech Statistical Office:**

**1) Agricultural, Forestry and Environmental Statistics Department**

- project administration unit
- responsible for the organisation, coordination, financial and methodological support
- generation of population and sample
- grossing up procedures
- dissemination of survey results
- delivery of the database of anonymized individual data to Eurostat.

**2) Field Surveys Units**

- recruitment and training of the interviewers,
  - distribution of questionnaires to the interviewers and their methodological support,
  - collecting of filled-in questionnaires, their coding and registering,
  - data processing (data entry and checking using Dataman Windows programme)
- 3) Unit for Processing of Agricultural and Forestry Indicators in Kind**
- questionnaire collection from legal persons and large natural persons,
  - centralised processing of questionnaires
  - processing of questionnaires
  - checks for correctness and completeness of the data files at the national level
  - development of net database and its delivery to the Agricultural Statistics Dept.

**4) Unit for Statistical Territorial Units**

- generation of geographical coordinates

**Institute of Agricultural Economics and Information:** SO 2007 computation, classification of holdings by their type of farming and economic size

Only minor delays with no significant influence to data quality and transmission time occurred during the course of the survey.

**12.1. Source data****12.1.a.1 The national definition of an agricultural holding**

Please mention if the national definition of the holding is as according to the EU definition [\[3\]](#) or not. If not, please mention the national definition of a holding.

The national definition of an agricultural holding is the same as defined in the Regulation (EC) No 1166/2008. Agricultural holdings involved in the survey undertake one or more of following agricultural activities:

- growing of non-perennial crops (NACE Rev. 2 code 01.1);
- growing of perennial crops (01.2) including wine production from self-produced grapes;
- plant propagation (01.3);
- animal production (01.4); agricultural holdings raising other animals (01.49) are excluded except (i) ones raising and breeding ostriches, emus and rabbits, and (ii) ones dealing with bee-keeping and production of honey and beeswax;
- mixed farming (01.5);
- support activities to agriculture and post-harvest crop activities (01.6): only holdings exclusively maintaining agricultural land in good agricultural and environmental condition (01.61).

**12.1.a.2 The number of holdings in the population disregarding any possible thresholds applied (the entire number of holdings in the country),** according to the EU definition of a holding or, if different from the EU definition of a holding, according to the national definition.

Please indicate the number. If it is not possible to provide this information, please provide the reasons.

It is not possible to provide information on the entire number of holdings in the country but only on number of holdings in the Farm Register.

The Farm Register includes holdings reaching the following threshold levels:

- 1 ha of utilised agricultural land own or rented, or
- area of 1 500 m<sup>2</sup> of intensive crops (orchards, vegetables, flowers), or
- 1 000 m<sup>2</sup> of vineyards, or 300 m<sup>2</sup> of greenhouses or hotbeds, or
- 1 head of cattle, or 2 heads of pigs, or 4 heads of sheep and goats, or
- 50 heads of poultry, or 100 heads of rabbits or fur animals.

As at the day of generation the population the Farm Register contained 46 556 agricultural holdings.

**12.1.a.3 The national survey coverage; the thresholds applied in the national survey (if any) and the geographical coverage**

Please briefly describe the national target population which is the population for which national inferences are made.

Please consider possible thresholds applied in the national survey and please mention them.

Please mention the geographical coverage (including any geographical areas not covered).

The survey included agricultural holdings reaching following threshold values as at the day of generating of the population:

- Area  $\geq$  5 ha of utilised agricultural area (own or rented) [A\_3\_1\$ha];
- or  $\geq$  1 ha of orchards [B\_4\_1\$ha]; or  $\geq$  3,500 m<sup>2</sup> of vineyards [B\_4\_4\$ha]
- or sum of area for vegetable, strawberries and flowers [B\_1\_7\$ha+B\_1\_8\$ha]  $\geq$  2,500 m<sup>2</sup>
- or  $\geq$  5 heads of cattle [C\_2\$heads], or  $\geq$  10 heads of pigs [C\_4\$heads],
- or  $\geq$  10 heads of sheep and goats [C\_3\_1\$heads+C\_3\_2\$heads];
- or  $\geq$  100 heads of poultry including ostriches [C\_5\$heads].

Geographical coverage: the whole Czech Republic

**12.1.a.4 (new) The number of holdings in the nationally covered population** (see 12.1.a.3), according to the EU definition of a holding or, if different from the EU definition of a holding, according to the national definition.

Please indicate the number. These are holdings in the national survey coverage. If national thresholds are applied, the size of the national survey population is the number of holdings in the population by considering the thresholds applied in the national survey (see 12.1.a.3).

26 246 holdings

**12.1.a.5(new) The survey coverage of the records sent to Eurostat**

The survey coverage of the records sent to Eurostat can be different from the national survey coverage in case very low (or no) national thresholds are applied.

Please indicate if the coverage of the records sent to Eurostat is different the national survey coverage. If yes, please indicate the differences and how you selected the records sent to Eurostat.

The coverage of the records sent to Eurostat is the same as the national survey coverage

**12.1.a.6 The number of holdings in the population covered by the records transferred to Eurostat, according to the EU definition of a holding and, if different from the EU definition of a holding, according to the national definition (this number should be reported as item 1, in the table from section 12.3.d).**

186 holdings surveyed; 26 246 holdings in the population covered by the records sent to Eurostat.

**12.1.a.7(new) Records sent to Eurostat on holdings with standard output equal to zero.**

These can be holdings with only fallow land and/or only kitchen gardens and/or only crops and animals for which standard output coefficients are not defined (crops and animals not valued). In the case of a few countries, a significant amount of records have been sent to Eurostat with standard output equal to zero. Please provide any information that could help Eurostat and users to better understand why standard output is equal to zero and why those holdings are included in the survey.

12 holdings;

11 holdings have fallow land and/or permanent grassland no longer for production purposes, which is maintained in good agricultural and environmental conditions.

1 holding has kitchen gardens only.

**12.1.a.8 Proofs that the requirements stipulated in art. 3.2 and (new) 3.3 of the Regulation 1166/2008 are met in the data transmitted to Eurostat**

Art. 3.2: However, Member States which use a survey threshold above one hectare shall fix this threshold at a level that excludes only the smallest agricultural holdings which together contribute 2% or less to the total utilised agricultural area excluding common land and 2% or less to the total number of livestock units.

Art. 3.3: In any case, all agricultural holdings reaching one of the physical thresholds specified in Annex II shall be covered.

**Confirmation of meeting requirements as set in Article 3.2**

	Farm Register (before sampling)	FSS 2013 population	Coverage (%)	FSS 2013 results	Coverage after grossing-up (%)

utilised agricultural area (ha)	3 556 329	3 494 480	98,3	3 491 472	98,2
Livestock unit (LSU) <sup>[1]</sup>	1 422 586	1 407 691	99,0	1 727 774	<121,5
Agricultural holding	46 556	26 655	x	26 246	x
Average acreage (ha per holding)	76	131	x	133	x

<sup>[1]</sup>< Livestock unit means a standard measurement unit that allows the aggregation of the various categories of livestock in order to enable them to be compared. 1 Livestock unit represents 500 kg of live weight of an animal.

### Confirmation of meeting thresholds set in Article 3.3

All agricultural holdings reaching at least one of the thresholds specified in Annex II of the Regulation are included to the survey (for list of threshold levels used see point 12.1.a.3).

#### 12.1.b Source of data

Please mention the source of data for example exhaustive coverage of units in a survey (census), sample survey, use of administrative sources, combinations, etc.

FSS 2013 was conducted as a sample survey. The target group consisted of agricultural holdings reaching threshold levels for the survey.

Variables on Rural Development Measures were taken from an administrative source (see 12.1.e)

#### 12.1.c (Sampling) frame

*Section 12.1.c refers to the frame used to identify holdings to be surveyed and therefore should be completed only in case of a sample survey or a census.*

*Section 12.1.c should not be completed when data are entirely taken from administrative sources. In this case, section 12.1.e of the report provides the relevant information.*

##### 12.1.c.1 Source of the frame

Please specify the source of the frame, for example a statistical register (farm register, business register etc.), an administrative source etc.

The frame for agricultural statistical surveys is based on the Farm register managed by the Agricultural Statistics Dept.

##### 12.1.c.2 Type of frame

Please specify whether it is a list frame or an area frame, whether you used a combination of multiple frames etc.

List frame

##### 12.1.c.3 Time reference and updating process for the frame

The Farm Register is updated regularly. Data on livestock numbers and areas under crops are updated yearly after finishing particular statistical surveys. Data in the Farm Register are not subject to any quality control.

In addition, administrative sources are used for Farm Register update: (i) Land Parcel Information system (LPIS) and (ii) Animal Register. The tables below compare data from the Farm Register and administrative sources.

#### Comparison of sources – utilised agricultural area (ha)

	Farm Register <sup>1)</sup>	LPIS <sup>2)</sup>	Cadastre <sup>3)</sup>
<b>Utilised agricultural area, total</b>	3 565 055	3 548 661	4 219 867
Arable land	2 526 807	2 504 674	2 985 792
Hop-gardens	5 103	5 007	10 312
Vineyards, total	15 711	14 213	19 652
Kitchen gardens	1 303	-	163 476
Orchards	22 745	23 019	46 172
Permanent grassland, total	993 127	990 250	994 461

#### Sources:

1) Czech Statistical Office (CZSO); updated on the basis of FSS 2013 results

2) Ministry of Agriculture, data as at 2.12.2013

3) Czech Office for Surveying, Mapping and Cadastre (COSMC) - administrative data source; the land is registered as agricultural land and its sub-categories irrespective whether it is utilised or not; data as at 31.12. 2013

#### Comparison of sources – livestock (heads)

	Farm Register <sup>1)</sup>	Animal Register <sup>2)</sup>
<b>Cattle, total</b>	1 367 969	1 432 780
Cows, total	558 059	574 942
Dairy cows	368 412	377 053
Other cows	189 647	197 889
<b>Pigs, total</b>	1 589 809	1 798 603
<b>Sheep, total</b>	211 049	283 456
<b>Goats, total</b>	22 446	38 457

#### Sources:

1) Czech Statistical Office (CZSO); updated on the basis of FSS 2013 results

2) Ministry of Agriculture, data as at 17.10. 2013

#### 12.1.d Sampling design

&lt;=" m="&gt;

Please describe the sampling design according to the following structure. This structure aims to increase the clarity and comparability of information between countries.

#### 12.1.d.1 the name of the sampling design and whether it is a probability design.

A probability sampling design ensures known probabilities for units selected. In practice, non-response generally makes samples depart from the probability ones. However, the point here is to report on whether or not the gross sample (net sample plus non-respondents) has been selected in a probability way.

#### Stratified random sampling

#### 12.1.d.2 (new) the number of sampling stages.

If the survey sample is selected from another sample (e.g. master sample) please consider this stage. If you use sub-sampling for some of the characteristics, please distinguish the cases in your answer.

#### One sampling stage

#### 12.1.d.3 (new);the sampling unit at each stage

For example, sampling units can be holdings in a single-stage design or municipalities/villages as primary sampling units and holdings as secondary sampling units in a two-stage design etc.

#### Holding (single-stage design)

#### 12.1.d.4 the stratification variables and the sampling stage where they are applied

For example, in a single-stage design, holdings can be stratified by region and size.

1. Region of holding's headquarters or natural person's permanent residence (NUTS3)
2. Agricultural production area<sup>1)</sup>
3. Size of the holding

1) Agricultural production areas are defined on the basis of their agro-ecological and economical conditions. In the Czech Republic are five areas: maize area, sugar beet area, potato area, potato-oats area, and mountainous area.

**Ad 1) Region: NUTS3; codes 11, 21, 31, 32, 41, 42, 51, 52, 53, 61, 62, 71, 72, 81.**

**Ad 2) Affiliation of a unit to agricultural production area:**

- Maize area and its subareas: codes 11, 12, 13
- **Sugar beet** area and its subareas: codes 21, 22, 23,
- **Potato** area and its subareas: codes 31, 32,
- **Potato-oats** area and its subareas: codes 33,
- **Mountainous** area and its subareas: codes 41, 42.

Due to insufficient total area in subareas 11, 12, and 13, units belonging to subareas 12 and 13 were affiliated to subarea 11. Similarly the subarea code 42 was replaced by 41. Therefore only codes 11, 21, 22, 23, 31, 32, 33 and 41 were allowed.

**Ad 3) Size of the holding:**

	Sample percentage	Size of the holding
11	7%	0.00 – 9.99 ha of UAA or 0 – 1.99 LSU
12	10%	10.00 - 24.99 ha of UAA or 2 – 4.99 LSU
13	15%	25.00 - 49.99 ha of UAA or 5 – 9.99 LSU
14	20%	50.00 - 119.99 ha of UAA or 10 – 19.99 LSU
15	25%	120.00 - 199.99 ha of UAA or 20 – 49.99 LSU
99	100%	200.00 ha and more of UAA or 50 LSU and more or 40 heads of poultry and more or 20 heads of sheep and more or 5 heads of goats and more or 1.50 ha of vineyards and more or 2.00 ha of orchard and more or 1.10 ha of vegetables and more or 0.30 ha of flowers and more or 0.30 ha of strawberries and more

On the basis of above-mentioned criteria every unit from the population was assigned with six-digit code XXYYZZ which defined its affiliation to particular stratum:

XX = size category (11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 99);

YY = abbreviated code of NUTS3 (11, 21, 31, 32, 41, 42, 51, 52, 53, 61, 62, 71, 72, 81);

ZZ = agricultural production area (11, 21, 22, 23, 31, 32, 33, 41).

Number of grossing-up strata constructed using the described way resulted in 521 combinations, although the theoretical maximum of combinations was 672 (6 x 14 x 8).

The final database sent to Eurostat includes only 470 strata as the remaining 51 strata contained only holdings not belonging to the target population (either not reaching the threshold levels for the survey or having ceased or temporarily stopped their agricultural activity).

#### 12.1.d.5 (new) the sampling method at each stage

The sampling method can be exhaustive selection, simple random sampling, systematic sampling with equal probabilities, systematic sampling with probabilities proportional to size, etc.

#### Stratified random sampling

The sample was defined as stratified random sample from the population based on affiliation of each unit to defined grossing-up group (stratum). Specific sampling rates for all units in a group (stratum) were assigned to each stratum. Units with sampling rate under 100% were selected from the population using random sampling without replication. The units selected were not put back to the population, i.e. every unit could have been chosen only once. In consequence, the probability of selection of units in the population changed after each sampling.

Random number generator program SAS Enterprise Guide 4.2 was used for this purpose.

#### 12.1.d.6 the list and description of full coverage strata

Full coverage strata are strata with complete enumeration (all units are selected in the sample).



All holdings belonging to the size stratum 99 (see 12.1.d.4) were surveyed exhaustively.

**12.1.d.7 the overall sample size, how it was determined and any allocation method used**

*Allocation methods can be equal allocation, proportional allocation, Neyman allocation, optimal allocation considering different costs across strata etc.*

Sample size: 11 942 holdings

Method used: optimal allocation considering different size of the holding across strata

Variable used for calculation the standard deviation within strata (for the optimal allocation): size of the holding (UAA, LSU); different costs across strata were not considered.

**12.1.d.8 sampling across time**

*This item refers to whether a new sample is drawn in each occasion, or a part or the whole sample is retained over all/several occasions. The latter two cases should be justified.*

A new sample is drawn in each occasion

**12.1.d.9 the software tool used in the sample selection**

SAS Enterprise Guide 4.2

**12.1.d.10 other relevant information, if any**

N/A

**12.1.e Use of administrative data sources**

**12.1.e.1 Name, legal base, time reference and (new) updating of the source**

*If more than one administrative data source is used, please provide this information for each of them.*

**Name:** State Agricultural Intervention Fund

**Description:** The State Agricultural Intervention Fund is an accredited paying agency - an administrator of financial subsidies both from the European Union and from the national financial funds. Within the scope of the Common Agricultural Policy, the financial subsidy is granted from the European Agricultural Guarantee Fund (EAGF) and for a current programming period (2007 – 2013) also from the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) and the European Fisheries Fund (EFF). The new Programme for Rural Development (PRV) drawing out financial resources from the EAFRD replaces current Horizontal Rural Development Plan (HRDP) and the Operational Programme for Rural Development and Multifunctional Agriculture (OP RVMZ).

**Legislation frame:** The State Agricultural Intervention Fund is a legal entity with residence in Prague and its activities are regulated by the Law No. 256/2000 Coll., concerning the State Agricultural Intervention Fund, as amended by the Law No. 128/2003 Coll. and the Law No. 85/2004 Coll. and the implementing regulations in the form of the Czech Government Order.

**Time reference:** 2011-2013

**Updating of the source:** after each approval of particular request

**List of characteristics taken from administrative data sources**

Code	Characteristics
G_1_1	Rural development support: advisory services
G_1_2	Rural development support: modernisation of agricultural holdings
G_1_3	Rural development support: adding value to agricultural and forestry products
G_1_6	Rural development support: Natura 2000 payments for agricultural area
G_1_8	Rural development support: Agri-environment payments
G_1_8_1	Rural development support: Agri-environment payments for organic farming
G_1_10	Rural development support: Diversification into non-agricultural activities
G_1_11	Rural development support: Encouragement of tourism activities

**12.1.e.2 Definition of the reporting unit (holding)**

*If more than one administrative data source is used, please provide this information for each of them.*

The database managed by the State Agricultural Intervention Fund includes all agricultural holdings which request for grants in given year.

**12.1.e.3 The purpose(s) of the use of administrative sources**

Purpose	Administrative source
- to totally replace the survey, on all characteristics and on the whole survey population	<i>Please specify the name of the administrative source(s) in the rows of this column. The row(s) where the name(s) of the source(s) is (are) specified indicate(s) the purpose(s) of the use of that (those) source(s).</i>
- to replace the survey on some of the characteristics and on the whole survey population. <i>Please indicate these (groups of) characteristics, the common identifiers and the method(s) of integration (record linkage algorithm).</i>	Name: State Agricultural Intervention Fund group of characteristics: Rural development measures Common identifiers: Unique identification number of a holding (a person in case of unregistered natural persons). Method(s) of integration: linkage of the FSS and RDM databases using the unique holdings' ID. In several cases the linkage for particular holding had to be searched in both databases step-by-step.
- to replace the survey on all characteristics and on a part of the survey population	
- to replace the survey on some of the characteristics and on a part of the survey population. <i>Please indicate these (groups of) characteristics, the common identifiers and the method(s) of integration (record linkage algorithm).</i>	
- to build/update the (sampling) frame (used for census or for sample survey)	
- to pre-fill answers in the questionnaires which are then checked by farmers during the survey	

- to impute item/unit non-response	
- to validate the survey data (quality control). <i>Please indicate actions taken in case of large discrepancies</i>	
- to calibrate of survey estimates. <i>Please indicate the calibration variables</i>	
- other (please specify in the next column)	

#### 12.1.e.4 Difficulties of using administrative source(s) and measures taken

For each administrative source used, please briefly describe any difficulties and the way those difficulties were addressed. Examples of difficulties:

- incoherence of concepts/definitions;
- incoherence of classification systems;
- different population coverage;
- problems creating the links between the units: the units in administrative sources do not correspond directly to the definition of required statistical units;
- problems creating the links between databases caused by e.g. the lack of common identifiers, obstacles related to IT issues etc.;
- impossibilities to establish cooperation with register owners;
- (too high) costs charged for the access by the register owners;
- problems related to data quality of the source;
- resistance to change caused by a general lack of trust in the quality of the source;
- timeliness and punctuality: the final validated data in the source may not be in time to meet statistical deadlines or may relate to a period which does not coincide with the statistical reference period;
- risks concerning the stability of the source to political changes etc.

Main problems were connected with creating simple links between databases caused by lack of common identifiers. In several cases it was not possible to create the linkage for particular holding automatically and both databases had to be searched step-by-step.

#### 12.1.e.5 Quality assessment of the administrative sources

Section 12.1.e.5 should not be completed when administrative sources are used only for building/updating the (sampling) frame of a census or a sample survey. In that case, other sections of the report (sections 5.3, 12.1.c, 12.3.d) provide relevant information.

		Administrative source and assessment of errors <i>Please specify the name of the administrative source(s) in this column, along with information required for each row.</i>
<b>-coverage:</b>		Name: State Agricultural Intervention Fund
	<b>- over-coverage</b> <i>If the source covers more units than it should, please provide an assessment of the over-coverage rate and mention whether the out-of-scope units were excluded.</i>	<The RDM database included 13 896 records out of which 6 935 were linked with FSS 2013 data; i.e. the over-coverage rate is 50.09%
	<b>- under-coverage</b> <i>If the source covers less units than it should, please provide an assessment of the extent of under-coverage (if possible) and mention if and how the missing information is derived.</i>	Cannot be evaluated by the CZSO
	<b>- misclassification</b> <i>Please mention whether the information allows for the requested classification of units and whether there are errors in classification variables.</i>	Cannot be evaluated by the CZSO
	<b>- multiple listings</b> <i>Please provide an assessment on units which were present more than once in the source and specify how the duplicates were eliminated.</i>	Not recorded
	<b>- rate of unreported events</b> <i>If data of the System for the Identification and Registration of Bovine Animals is used, please provide an assessment of the rate of unreported events. Unreported events refer to births, deaths or loss, sales or change of owners etc. of animals, which create under – and/or over-coverage errors for the estimates of animals.</i>	Cannot be evaluated by the CZSO
	<b>- missing data</b> (analogue to item and unit non-response errors in a survey). <i>Please provide an assessment of missing data, specify for which characteristics and how it was accounted for (e.g. by imputation).</i>	Not recorded
	<b>- errors in register variables</b> (analogue to measurement errors in a survey) i.e. erroneous values for certain variables	Cannot be evaluated by the CZSO
	<b>- processing errors.</b> <i>Please provide an assessment. You can mention here imputation methods used, if any.</i>	Not evaluated
	<b>- coherence</b> (comparison to other available data) of the administrative data (ex-ante and/or ex-post)	Not evaluated
	<b>- other drawbacks (if any)</b> of the use of data from the administrative source. <i>Please specify the drawbacks in the next column.</i>	-

[3] See Article 2 of Regulation (EC) 1166/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council on farm structure surveys and the survey on agricultural production methods and repealing Council Regulation (EEC) 571/88

#### 12.2. Frequency of data collection

(new) Please indicate the frequency of data collection.

Given by the Regulation (EC) No 1166/2008.

#### 12.3. Data collection

##### 12.3.a Data collection modes

Please specify the data collection mode(s) used.

These can be for example:

- Telephone

The data collection is carried out through the telephone interviews, usually supported by the CATI technology.

- **Face-to-face**

An interviewer visits selected holdings to directly communicate with them and get the required data.

- **Internet**

The data collection is carried out by using questionnaires which can be completed through internet applications.

- **Self-completed paper questionnaires**

The data is gathered through self-completed paper questionnaires which can be collected on a spot or sent to the survey organisation by mail.

- **Mixed-mode**

Several modes for data collection are combined. The typical example is the survey where the telephone interviews are complemented with the face-to-face interviews for the respondents who were not reached by telephone.

- **Mixed-mode**

- 1) Legal persons and large natural persons (with their Standard Output above 27 000 €): self-completed paper questionnaires (communicated by regular mail or e-mail);
- 2) Small natural persons and self-suppliers (holdings run by subsistence farmers - groups 631, 632, 633 according to the ISCO-08 classification): face-to-face interviews;
- 3) Internet questionnaires available for all types of holdings

### 12.3.b Data entry modes

Please specify the data entry mode(s) used.

These can be, for example:

- Optical character recognition (OCR);
- Electronic data capture during personal interview;
- Entering the data online by the holder etc.

- Electronic data capture during personal interview;
- Electronic data capture from filled-in paper questionnaire;
- Entering the data online by the holder

### 12.3.c Measures taken to increase response rates

Please specify, for example:

- call-back strategies, written / telephone reminders, contacting respondents who have only partly completed the questionnaires;
- giving priority to more important, for example large holdings;
- taking care that the mailing list is based on up-to-date information;
- training staff in handling difficult respondents;
- legal actions taken on non-response.

- call-back strategies, written / telephone reminders, contacting respondents who have only partly completed the questionnaires;
- giving priority to important holdings, e.g. large ones;
- taking care that the mailing list is based on up-to-date information;
- training the staff in handling difficult respondents;

Although the Law 89/1995 Coll., on the State Statistical Service, sets down rules for penalties to be applied in case of not providing requested data, the CZSO has never applied this approach.

### 12.3.d Monitoring of response and non-response

The following table should be completed only in case of a sample survey or a census.

It should **not** be completed when data are entirely taken from administrative sources. In the latter case, section 12.1.e.5 provides relevant information.

The following table aims to collect exact information of the number of holdings in a uniform way. This information allows, among other, calculating response rates according to the definition of response rates in the Eurostat (2009) [ESS Handbook for Quality Reports](#), page 49. These definitions of the response rates are presented in the handbook for sample surveys but, as stated in the same handbook, page 57, they are also applicable to censuses.

The following table refers to the number of holdings covered by the records sent to Eurostat.

- If you send records on all surveyed holdings to Eurostat, then please include all surveyed holdings.

- If you send records on a subset of surveyed holdings to Eurostat (that, according to Regulation 1166/2008, account for 98% of the utilised agricultural area and 98% of the livestock units), then please consider only the subset of holdings transferred to Eurostat, if possible. If this is not possible, please explain and then include information concerning all holdings surveyed in the country.

This table refers to the number of holdings according to the EU definition, and, if different from the EU definition [4], according to the national definition. Please specify the case.

Common land holdings (special holdings created to report common land), if any, should not be included in the number of the holdings of any category below. They should be reported in section 8.1.d.4

1.	<b>Number of holdings in the population covered by the records sent to Eurostat</b> Please note that the survey coverage of the records sent to Eurostat can be different from the national survey coverage in case very low (or no) national thresholds are applied. In case of a census <b>1=3+4+5</b>	11 186
2.	<b>Number of holdings in the gross sample</b> The number of holdings selected from the sampling frame to be included in the sample. This item should be completed <u>only</u> in case of a sample survey, in which case <b>2=3+4+5</b>	>11 942
3.	<b>(new) Number of ineligible holdings</b> The number of surveyed holdings which result to be out-of-scope (the frame is not updated and the data collection reveals that some holdings e.g. fall below set thresholds during the reference period), which do not exist at the selected address, which have the activities ceased during the reference period etc.	756
3.1	<b>Number of holdings with ceased activities</b> This item is a subset of 3. <b>3.1&gt;=3.1.1+3.1.2</b>	403
3.1.1	<b>Number of holdings which definitively ceased i.e. the land is abandoned.</b> This item should be completed only if information is available.	106
3.1.2	<b>Number of holdings with ceased activities following the change of manager</b> This item should be completed only if information is available.	297
4	<b>(new) Number of holdings with unknown eligibility status</b> The number of surveyed holdings which could not be contacted (e.g. in a CATI survey) and for which it is not	0

	<i>certain if they are eligible (e.g.in scope) or not.</i>	
5	<b>(new) Number of eligible holdings</b> <i>The number of surveyed holdings which are eligible</i> <b>5=5.1+5.2</b>	11 186
5.1	<b>Number of non-responding holdings</b> <i>The number of eligible holdings which:</i> - were contacted but refused to take part in the survey; - were contacted but were unable to participate in the survey for various reasons; - participated in the survey but the entire survey form cannot be used because of poor quality etc. <i>This item refers to holdings for which no data is collected (unit non-response).</i> <b>5.1&gt;=5.1.1+5.1.2</b>	247
5.1.1	<b>Number of non-responding holdings – re-weighted</b>	0
5.1.2	<b>Number of non-responding holdings – imputed</b>	247
5.2	<b>Number of responding holdings</b> <i>This item includes holdings which provided completed questionnaires, either entirely or partially.</i>	10 939

**12.3.e Questionnaire(s)**

*Please annex the questionnaire(s) used for the data collection, using the "Add file" button. If possible, please provide the questionnaire in English, French or German.*

[4] See Article 2 of Regulation (EC) 1166/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council on farm structure surveys and the survey on agricultural production methods and repealing Council Regulation (EEC) 571/88

**Annexes:**

[FSS 2013 questionnaire \(including methodological notes\)](#)

**12.4. Data validation****12.4.a Edit rules/checks**

*Please mention edit rules applied. For example: data format checks, completeness checks, routing (skip) checks, range/outlier checks, relational checks, ratio edits, etc.*

completeness checks,  
relational checks,  
data format checks,  
range/outlier checks

**12.4.b Tools used for data validation**

*Please mention tools used.*

DSM validation rules developed by Eurostat.

**12.4.c Level of data validation**

*Please mention. For example, data validation can be done at the level of the interviewer, of the supervisor, of the local collection centre, of the final collection centre.*

- 1) basic checks by interviewers during the collection of questionnaires in the field
- 2) checks at questionnaire delivery by external interviewers at the CZSO regional offices
- 3) checks during the processing (logic checks, checks for completeness, linkage to nomenclatures, duplicities, etc.),
- 4) validation controls by the Dept. of Agricultural Statistics.

**12.5. Data compilation**

*Sections 12.5.a and 12.5.b should be completed only in case of sample surveys.*

**12.5.a Methods for deriving the extrapolation factor (the weight)**

*Please give a description of the extrapolation procedures used to weight the data of the sampled holdings to the population, discussing the different steps taken, as follows:*

**12.5.a.1 Design weights**

*Please explain how design weights were obtained. In case the approach departed from the usual one that consists of taking the inverse of the inclusion probabilities, then the latter should be explained.*

*Design weights are defined as the inverse of the units' selection probabilities.*

Grossing-up was performed for each grossing-up group separately. Grossing-up groups are used in their whole range only for generation of the sample (keeping the proportionality among regions) and for final aggregation by region. In grossing-up procedures, only (i) affiliation to an agricultural production area and (ii) size category was used.

**12.5.a.2 Adjustment of weights for non-response**

*Please mention if you applied re-weighting for non-response. If yes, then the method used to determine the correction factors should be explained: reweighted Horvitz-Thompson estimator, ratio estimation, regression estimation, etc.*

*Please indicate if response homogeneity groups have been created.*

Re-weighting was not applied.

**12.5.a.3 Adjustment of weights to external data sources**

*Please mention if you adjusted the weights to external sources and if so please describe and mention the variables used from the sources and the sources. Generally, samples are adjusted to external data sources in order to make their accuracy better. For instance, the calibration technique aims at calculating new weights which provide error-free estimates for a certain number of characteristics. If the characteristics are strongly correlated with the variables of interest, then the level of accuracy for most of the survey estimates is improved.*

No adjustment to external sources.

**12.5.a.4 Any other applied adjustment of weights**

*For example, extreme weights (which increase the variance of the estimates) can be trimmed.*

No adjustment of weights.

**12.5.b Formulae applied for estimation methods**

Please annex the formulae applied for estimation methods, using the "Add file" button.

**12.5.c Other relevant information (if any)**

N/A

**Annexes:**

[Formulae applied for estimation methods](#)

**12.6. Adjustment**

[Not requested]

**13. Comment**

[Top](#)

**13.a Any regional specification**

Please include relevant information such as on extreme weather conditions in certain region(s) during the agricultural year (reference period), differences in methodology across regions etc.

The Farm Register was updated on the basis of FSS 2013 results as well as results of other surveys. However, the Farm Register covers agricultural holdings where the agricultural area utilised for farming is one hectare or more (see Article 3, par. 1a), 1b) of Regulation (EC) No. 1166/2008 of European Parliament and of the Council). The average area per holding is 76.07 ha.

	Farm Register before sampling	Farm Register after the update
Utilised agricultural area (ha)	3 556 329.47	3 565 055.06
Agricultural holding	46 556	46 863
Average acreage (ha per holding)	76.39	76.07

**13.b Possible improvements in the future**

-

**13.c Other annexes**

Please annex any other(s) file(s), deemed as useful, using the "Add file" button.

Please indicate here the nature and purpose of the file(s).

-

**Related metadata**

[Top](#)

**Annexes**

[Top](#)