

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. Ministère de l'agriculture, de l'agroalimentaire et de la forêt (MAAF, Ministry of Agriculture, Agrifood and Forestry) Secretariat-General Service de la statistique et de la prospective (SSP, Statistics Department)

Time Dimension: 2013-A0

Data Provider: FR6

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](#)

1.1. Contact organisation	<p><i>Please provide the name of the organisation of the contact points for the data or metadata.</i></p> <p>Ministère de l'agriculture, de l'agroalimentaire et de la forêt (MAAF, Ministry of Agriculture, Agrifood and Forestry) Secretariat-General Service de la statistique et de la prospective (SSP, Statistics Department)</p>
1.2. Contact organisation unit	<p><i>Please specify an addressable subdivision of an organisation.</i></p> <p>Bureau des statistiques structurelles, environnementales et forestières (BSSEF)</p>
1.5. Contact mail address	<p><i>Please specify the postal address of the contact points for the data or metadata.</i></p>

SSP-BSSEF
 Complexe agricole d'Auzeville
 BP 32688
 31326 CASTANET TOLOSAN

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 (FSS 2013) was conducted entirely by the Ministry of Agriculture. Its statistical service, which is an integral part of the public statistics system, acted as contracting owner and project manager. Surveys were conducted for all farms of structural parts (FSS), and other gainful activities (OGA).

Farm structure surveys meet three objectives:

- to identify the structure of farms and measure their development;
- to identify changes in agricultural production;
- to monitor the agricultural population.

The list of agricultural units was based on two main sources :

- the national farm register created using the general agricultural census conducted in 2010 (FSS 2010) and updated by national surveys conducted since then
- a list of SIRENE (French business register) agricultural units created since February 1st, 2010 (after the beginning of FSS 2010).

The combination of these two sources aimed at creating an updated list of farms.

Two samples were selected, one in each of these sources, to constitute the list of farms to survey.

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

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

<p>- the reference of the national legal base of the FSS survey (Act, Government Decree, etc.)</p>	<p>The Decree No 2009-529 of 11 May 2009 on conducting a general agricultural census in 2010 (2010 FSS) and an agriculture survey in 2013 (FSS 2013), among other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - entrusts the survey to the SSP (MAAF) (see item 1.1); - defines the objectives (statistics on agriculture and food from the statistical register of agricultural holdings)
<p>- the scope and the coverage of the survey</p>	<p>The same Decree sets the precise scope of the survey (1 ha or 20 ares of specialised crops).</p> <p>The territorial coverage of the survey consists in the whole metropolitan and overseas French territory, except for :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the territories of Saint-Martin, Saint-Barthelemy and Mayotte which are excluded ; • a part of the French Guyana which is excluded. The guyanese territory was restricted in order to focus on professional and more accessible holdings, on the coast side : it was limited to 3 052 holdings, instead of 5 983 units surveyed by FSS 2010.
<p>- the frequency and the reference period of</p>	<p>Two FSS surveys take place between 2010 and 2020 census : one in 2013, and one 2016.</p>

the survey	The reference period is from 2012, November 1st, to 2013, October 31th. For livestock, the reference date is 2013, November 1st.
- the responsibility for the survey	<p>The SSP (see item 1.1) has been given the task of carrying out the FSS 2013.</p> <p>The same Decree authorises local advisory committees to meet in preparatory phases.</p> <p>The <i>Conseil national de l'information statistique</i> (CNIS, National Council on Statistical Information), a collaborative body representing the various social and economic partners, has given a favourable opinion on conducting the survey and a label on its implementation conditions to guarantee compliance with professional rules. The operation was given an approval number (2013X085AG) for the year 2013 by the Minister for Agriculture and the Minister for Economy and Finance.</p>
- the administrative and financial provisions	<p>At national level, FSS management is carried out by a project manager and its assistant.</p> <p>In each regional delegation, data collection management, data validation and dissemination are carried out by two persons.</p> <p>The total staff cost is around 3 200 000 €, partially financed by EU grant (1 500 000€).</p> <p>The main direct cost to be added is the enumerators salaries.</p>
- the obligations of the respondents with respect to the survey	The law obliges farmers to give precise answers to the questions asked. Failure to reply or a deliberately inaccurate response gives rise to court proceedings, and an administrative fine is imposed as the final penalty.
- the identification, protection and obligations of survey enumerators	Survey interviewers are recruited by regional statistical services. They are bound by professional secrecy.
- the right of access to administrative data	The official statistical service (SSP) of the Ministry in charge for Agriculture (MAAF) is entitled by law to access administrative registers, such as SIRENE, data from CAP aid declarations, BDNI (national identification database), etc...
- confidentiality provisions	The same Decree specifies that the answers collected come under the Statistical Confidentiality Act (No 51-711 of 7 June 1951) and the "Information Technology and Freedoms" Act (No 78-17 of 6 January 1978). In accordance with the Statistical Confidentiality Act (No 51-711 of 7 June 1951), the data collected are professional, and the interviewers and statisticians are bound by professional secrecy.

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).

Several user committees were convened.

They covered:

- the main directorates of the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries,
- the Institut National de Recherche Agronomique (INRA, National Institute of Agronomic Research),
- the Assemblée Permanente des Chambres d'Agriculture (APCA, Permanent Assembly of the Chambers of Agriculture),
- the professional organisations,
- the organic farming agency,
- regional representatives, etc...

They gave their opinions on the various aspects of the questionnaire and on the instructions to interviewers.

The main information collected concerns:

- identification of the farm structure and measurement of its development:

- legal form of holdings;
- type of tenure;
- farm area;
- farm equipment;
- farm management;
- signs of quality and sales, through low food-mile systems;
- diversification;
- economic size of holdings measured by standard output (estimated from data on the area and livestock);
- technical/economic orientation of holdings (estimated from data on the area and livestock);

- identification of agricultural production capacity and the measurement of change:

- measuring holdings' cultivated area and crop rotation;
- measuring livestock population and breeding capacity;

- monitoring the agricultural population:

- characteristics of the family working on the holdings (training, working time, etc.);
- measuring the amount of work needed to run the holding: family labour, permanent, seasonal or temporary employees, recourse to the services of agricultural contractors or of equipment-sharing cooperatives;

- monitoring agricultural practices:

- data on irrigated areas;
- areas under vegetable cultivation;
- energy crops.

Information collected for national needs

Certain characteristics are surveyed for national needs. They are intended to meet the needs expressed when users are consulted prior to the drafting of the questionnaire, and mainly constitute technical instructions from the Ministry of Agriculture, research institutes and professional organisations:

- identification from main agricultural partners (CAP area declarations, computerised vineyard register, animal identification database, organic certification). These identifiers make it possible either to respond directly by using administrative data, complete the responses in advance, or check that data collection has been exhaustive;
- farm management. These issues give a better grasp of the future of the farms (whether they have a successor, etc.);
- signs of quality and marketing via low food-mile systems. These relate to production and marketing systems which are encouraged;
- diversification via a body which is legally separate from the farm. Once turnover generated by diversification reaches a certain threshold, the farmer is obliged by law to create a legal entity which is separate from the

farm. In the individual data submitted to EUROSTAT, we limited the response to diversification within the farm in order to be consistent with the FADN (Farm Accountancy Data Network). However, to analyse the phenomenon, account must be taken of diversification through a separate entity;

- livestock breeding capacity. This makes it possible to verify the coherence of the livestock numbers recorded, especially in the case of a partial or total cull for health reason;
- poultry annual production. Poultry is generally reared in batch, with a succession of different species in the barn. The estimated annual production gives a more realistic overview of the total production of the farm;
- areas under horticulture and nurseries cultivation. The last national census of this production was in 2001. This data can be used to measure changes in this very competitive sector, currently in crisis.

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.

The reference period for **data on crops, production methods and labour** is the 2012-2013 agricultural production year (1 November 2012 to 31 October 2013).

For livestock, the date is 1 November 2013 or, in case of cull, the day before the cull.

For rural development, calendar years 2011, 2012 and 2013 were taken into account.

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.

Given the climate conditions, no cotton is grown.

There are no genetically modified crops since they are prohibited under French law.

Permanent crops grown under shelter have been counted using the corresponding crop codes in order to obtain a complete distribution of permanent crops. It must be noted that these crops cover only 227.7 ha on 1 356 farms in FSS 2013, i.e. 0.2 ha on average.

As in previous surveys, only the total olive grove area was requested (B_4_3). No areas are intended exclusively for table olives. They represent an extremely small proportion of the harvest which cannot be converted into a surface area.

[\[1\]](#) 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.

Annexes:

[Non-existent and non-significant 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.)

The main source of errors is sampling error. There are very few errors due to no response (see 5.3.3.1 : only 1.03 % of non - response).

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.

The estimation of RSEs, expressed as a percentage, is equivalent to the coefficient of variation.

$$\frac{\sqrt{\hat{V}_s(\hat{\theta})}}{\hat{\theta}_s} \cdot 100$$

It is estimated by the formulae :

Where $\hat{V}_s(\hat{\theta})$ is the estimated variance of the estimator, and $\hat{\theta}_s$ is the estimator of the total.

Two variance formulae are used :

1. On the non-calibrated sample part (units from the SIRENE register) :

$$v(\hat{t}_y) = N^2 \frac{1-n/N}{n} s_y^2$$

the variance formulae is :

where :

- s_y^2 is the dispersion of the variable of interest over the sample s
- N is the total number of units in the population from the SIRENE register
- n is the number of units in the sample from the SIRENE register.

We used a stratified survey design, so s_y^2 is such as $v(\hat{t}_y) = N^2 \frac{1-n/N}{n} s_y^2$ on each sub-population.

2. On the calibrated sample part (units from the SSP farm register):

The variable of interest y_i , is regressed on the variables used in the calibration (number of farms at the NUTS3 level, UAA and SO), using design weights of i , called d_i (that is the inverse probability of selection). We obtain the regression residuals e_i :

$$e_i = Y_i - \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^N d_i X_i X_i' \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N d_i X_i Y_i \right) \right] X_i$$

$$g_i = e_i \frac{w_i}{d_i}$$

A variable is created using sampling weights of i , called w_i :

The definitions of d_i and w_i are the same as the ones described page 122 of the *Handbook on precision requirements and variance estimation for FSS households surveys*.

Finally, y_i is replaced by g_i in the variance formulae :

$$v(\hat{t}_y) = N^2 \frac{1-n/N}{n} s_y^2$$

Annexes:

[The actual value of characteristics used for the application of precision requirements](#)

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.

As it is available in the annex, there are few cases where estimated RSEs are above thresholds :

- Area of plants harvested green in NUTS 2 region FR81 (estimated RSE = 5.33%).
- Area of pasture and meadow, excluding rough grazing, in NUTS 2 region FR61 (estimated RSE = 5.14%)
- Area of pasture and meadow, excluding rough grazing, in NUTS2 region FR82 (estimated RSE =13.03%)
- Area of pasture and meadow, excluding rough grazing, in NUTS1 region FR8 - MEDITERRANEE (estimated RSE =5.46%)
- Amount of other cows in NUTS2 region FR61 (estimated RSE = 5.68%)
- Amount of sheep in NUTS2 region FR61 (estimated RSE = 8.45%)
- Amount of poultry in NUTS2 region FR61 (estimated RSE = 5.25%)
- Amount of other pigs in NUTS2 region FR51 (estimated RSE = 8.4%)
- Amount of poultry in NUTS2 region FR52 (estimated RSE = 5.12%)

Concerning the area of pasture and meadow in FR82, we knew before conducting the FSS that the precision could be above the thresholds : farms in this region are very scattered. To improve lightly the RSE, we should have add too many questionnaires, for an expensive cost in final.

Concerning sheep and other pigs in FR61 and FR51, and poultry in FR61, the deterioration of precision can be due to the random nature of the sample. The evolution between 2010 and 2013 could also explain the slight deterioration of precision for the other characteristics mentioned above.

Annexes:

[Relative standard errors. Cases where precision requirements are applicable are colored in orange. Cases where RSE is above thresholds are colored in red.](#)

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.

A possible bias could be due to questionnaires stopped without a face to face interview, whereas the farm should have been entirely investigated. For instance, this could happen if the interviewed farmer declares the holder (REF -Responsable économique et financier, see 8.2.c) has changed, while he hasn't indeed. In this case, the interview was stopped and no questionnaire was collected, since the holder was supposed to be different. These units were considered as ineligible units, and were not investigated (no characteristics collected).

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.

The combination of the national SSP farm register (composed of units investigated by FSS 2010, which data were updated by SSP surveys conducted since FSS 2010) on one hand, and of the SIRENE register of local units created since 2010 on the other hand, was aimed at establishing an exhaustive and updated list of agricultural holdings to enquiry.

The territories of Saint-Martin, Saint-Barthélemy, Mayotte, and the non-professional and less accessible holdings from Guyana territory are excluded of the scope of FSS 2013.

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.

The list of holdings provided by the administrative register (SIRENE) was based on the main activity of the holding. As a consequence, non farming units could appear in this list (we found 676 of them during the survey). In order to check if the unit was indeed an agricultural holding, an additional question was asked by phone to the respondent before making the appointment for completing the questionnaire. If the unit was not an agricultural holding, the questionnaire was not completed, but the sampling weights were not changed, since these units make it possible to estimate the whole population of non agricultural holdings in the sample.

In the sample, 7175 units have ceased their production since 2010 : there are no more active in 2013. Thus, they are not investigated, and can represent a form of over-coverage. However, this is corrected by the sample of units from SIRENE register (which have been created since 2010).

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.

The only misclassification encountered is the change of location of the holding : few units (around 200) have changed of department between 2010 and 2013. In this case, they have been classified in an exhaustive stratum, and the residual sample was calibrated.

5.3.1.d Contact errors

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

The phone number was missing for units detected by the administrative register (SIRENE). The use of a private provider enabled to collect 2200 phone numbers out of 6500 units. Then, regional agents and investigators sought

to find out missing phone numbers.

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.

The use of two sources (the SSP farm register and a list of local units provided by SIRENE) lead to a redundancy of very few units. This affects farmers that didn't provide an identification number (SIRET) during FSS 2010. To avoid any duplication in the sample, the date of creation of the holding was asked by phone to the respondent before making an appointment for the face to face interview.

5.3.1.f Other relevant information, if any

It is hard to measure.

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).

It is hard to measure, since it is largely corrected by the sample of holdings from SIRENE.

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.

Errors of observation are, of course, possible even if the controls (cf. item 12.4) set in place during and after collection were intended to detect them. These residual errors cannot be measured.

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

These rates are not available.

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

To prevent mistakes in questionnaires, collected data were compared with data from FSS 2010, or from the aid application for 2013, especially for units which showed the most important evolutions between 2010 and 2013.

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.

There are two categories of non-respondent units :

- those which could not be contacted (1263), for different reasons : the holder could be hospitalized, travelling, or away from home ;

- and those which were contacted but refused to respond to the survey. In this case, the questionnaire was transmitted to a regional member of the agricultural statistics survey staff. In most cases, this person succeeded in lifting the refusal of response.

Among non-respondents units, 33 farms belonged to the exhaustive strata because of their size. These units were imputed with data collected by FSS 2010.

All other non respondents were not imputed : in this case, non response was accounted by reweighting on units with the same NUTS2, farm type, and SO.

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.

The Computer - Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) interface checked that all the questions had been answered. There were no partial non-responses.

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).

Total non-response represented only 1.03% of surveyed holdings (547 non-responding units among 53 307 eligible units).

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.

There were no partial non-responses.

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.

It is hard to measure.

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.

Imputation was used for 33 non-respondent units. See 5.3.3.a.

5.3.4.c Imputation methods

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

For 33 non-respondent units belonging to the exhaustive strata, the questionnaire was completed using data from FSS 2010.

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

Corrections to the file were made by permanent agents in the regional and national agricultural statistics services of the SSP, after running controls described in item 12.4.a.

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.

33 units were imputed out of 52 793 respondent units : that makes a rate of 0.06%.

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 partial response was collected (all questionnaires were entirely completed). Therefore, no model was used for the estimation of characteristics of the survey.

5.3.6. Data revision

- There wasn't any data revision beside data validation described in part 12.4.

5.3.6.1. Data revision - policy

Brief description of the revision policy

Our methodology consists in transmitting validated data to regional services before publishing them, and before Eurostat validation. If regional services find significant errors that were not detected during the validation stage, a thorough analyse is conducted in order to determine whether the data must be corrected or not. Then, the first national publication is prepared, if possible after validation of the data by Eurostat.

Once Eurostat has validated the data and after the first national publication, FSS data is considered as definitive. At this stage, we do not intend to make any further revision, unless two exceptional cases :

- a major error is found : in this case, an erratum could be issued ;
- a farmer wishes to correct one or several characteristics he has declared during the interview. Farmers are entitled to access and correct their declaration ("Information Technology and Freedoms" Act No 78-17 of 6 January 1978).

However, these both cases are very unlikely.

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.

There was no revision of data after the stage of validation (see 12.4).

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.

The first provisional results were disseminated 13 months after the end of the 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.

The main final results have been available 19 months after the end of the reference period.

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.

The main final results have been available five months later than planned in the initial calendar.

This delay was mainly due to :

- the effort of simplification of the FSS 2013 questionnaire, and of coordination with European concepts, which lead to a great work of reconciliation with FSS 2010 concepts,
- the simplification of CAPI interface, with less major controls, in order to improve the ergonomics and reactivity, but which induced a greater work during the validation stage.

7. Accessibility and clarity

[Top](#)

-

7.1. Dissemination format - News release

[Not requested]

7.2. Dissemination format - Publications

Regular and ad-hoc publications in which data are made available to the public

7.2.a The nature of publications

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 results will be available in:

- The "Primeur" journals, four to eight pages long by theme and at national and regional levels;
- General tables for all types of public;
- The "DISAR" tool allows Web users to build their own table;

A publication of a four-page *Agriste Primeur*, containing the main final results, is planned for May.

The regional services also publish the results of the survey in various forms in *Agriste* documents (*Primeurs*, tables, journals, etc.).

7.2.b Date of issuing (actual or planned)

The first provisional results were delivered to regional services in December 2015.

The final results were delivered to regional services in January 2015. It will be disseminated to external users during the summer 2015, in order to synchronize it with the publication of the four-page *Agriste Primeur*.

7.2.c References for on-line publications.

All the results will be available on our website: <http://www.agreste.agriculture.gouv.fr/>

7.3. Dissemination format - online database

Please provide information about on-line databases in which the disseminated data can be accessed.

Basic tables, local records, and tables to compile, in a format allowing a direct comparison between 2010 and 2013, will be available on the website of the Ministry of Agriculture:

<http://www.agreste.agriculture.gouv.fr/>

7.3.1. Data tables - consultations

The number of consultations of on-line data tables for a given time period

Please indicate on-line data tables with an indicative number of consultations.

It is too soon to answer to this question.

7.4. Dissemination format - microdata access

[Not requested]

7.5. Documentation on methodology

7.5.a Available documentation on methodology on FSS national survey

Please provide references.

Several documents were provided to people participating to the survey :

- two questionnaires : one for metropolitan regions, and one for overseas departments (DOM);
- Instructions manual designed for regional staff and investigators, with definitions and precisions about concepts used in the questionnaire;
- CAPI user guide;
- Methodological letters transmitted to regional staff before and during the survey, concerning the questionnaire, data collection, data checks, etc...

A forum was also daily updated with questions from regional staff, and answers from national FSS team.

The questionnaire is available in Annex.

7.5.b Main scientific references

Please provide references.

Annexes:

[The questionnaire used for FSS 2013. Blue, pink and green colours are used for questions which concerns only metropolitan regions or DOM.](#)

7.5.1. Metadata completeness - rate

[Not requested]

7.5.2. Metadata - consultations

[Not requested]

7.6. Quality management - documentation

Available documentation on quality

Please provide references.

No references on quality.

7.7. Dissemination format - other

[Not requested]

8. Comparability

[Top](#)

-

8.1. Comparability - geographical

8.1.a National vs. EU definition of a holding

Please indicate possible differences between the national definition and the EU definition of the holding [\[2\]](#). Please also indicate the reasons.

The national and the European definitions of the holding are the same. The definition of an agricultural holding used in France is the one described in Regulation (EC) No 1166/2008.

More precisely, to be considered as an agricultural holding, the unit must reach all three of the following conditions :

1 - have an agricultural activity, that is to say, the farm must satisfy at least one of the three following conditions :

- the farm produces agricultural products. The list of products considered as agricultural ones is based in the agricultural activities from the Annex 1 of the Regulation (EC) No 1166/2008, which refers to Regulation (EC) No 1893/2006 (NACE Rev.2).
- and/or the farm keeps its lands in a good environmental and agricultural condition (BCAE)
- and/or the farm makes its land available

2 - reach a minimum size : the general threshold is one hectare, except for certain types of specialised production (see 12.1.a.3).

3 - be subject to an independent management.

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.

The population covered in the national survey is the same population than the one covered by the records sent to Eurostat.

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.

Revision 9 of the Handbook was used for the farm structure survey.

The **farm manager** (*chef d'exploitation*) is defined as the person in charge of day-to-day management. We therefore look at the family of the farm manager and not that of the holder (exploitant). This divergence does not pose any problems in the case of individual farms, i.e. the majority of farms. In FSS 2013, when considering extrapolated results, only 3012 farms (0.6%) were found with a sole holder who is not the manager.

In FSS 2013, the "**mushrooms**" variable is measured in terms of production and not in terms of area. A correspondence key has therefore been used to meet the Community requirements. One hectare is considered to produce 180 tons of mushrooms per year. The same correspondence key was used in FSS 2010.

In FSS 2013, an AWU equals to 225 days. Considering that a day equals to 7 hours, an AWU equals to 1575 hours.

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.

The methodology used for collecting information on common land units is the same in FSS 2013 as in FSS 2010.

The common land is maintained and managed by special holdings (i.e. common land holdings) employing 2019 permanent people for 624 AWU. They all file the application for the agri-environmental pasture premium (*prime herbagère agroenvironnementale*, PHAE) themselves, which they then divide between the farmers on a pro rata basis according to their use of the grassland. These units have been registered as agricultural holdings for which areas and

labour data have been collected.

The general questionnaire was used.

Among the global utilised agricultural area of common land units in 2013, 59% is utilised for farming by the owner, 37% by the tenant, and 4% by shared farming or other modes.

In order to identify common lands in FSS data, it is necessary to select A_2_1=y.

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.

Results concerning common lands in FSS 2013 (number of holdings, total area covered) significantly differ from the ones in FSS 2010 : some investigators and farmers may have misunderstood the definition of common lands during FSS 2010. The main reason is that it was the first time that this concept was introduced.

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.

In France, 1 272 common land farms cover 675 128 ha, of which 99.2% is still grassland.

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.

1 272 are common land farms.

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.

The coordinates are the address of the farm.

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).

Since the data of the overseas departments could not be supplied in ETRS89, it was agreed with Eurostat that all the coordinates would be provided in the WGS84 benchmark, SRID 4326.

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).

In order to depersonalise the data on X and Y (see 8.1.e.1), they were grouped into one single point per commune, the centre of the commune polygon. The largest distance between the centre and the most remote point of the commune is less than the tolerance level set out in the Regulation.

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).

The headquarters of the agricultural holding is the farmstead (house and farm buildings together), where it exists, otherwise the most used agricultural building, or the biggest plot of land if there are no buildings.

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).

There are no differences.

[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.

As for FSS 2010, the definition of agricultural holding was brought closer to that of agricultural establishment used in SIRENE (the French business register). The identifier in SIRENE is the SIRET number and a decision was made to apply the simple rule that 1 agricultural SIRET = 1 agricultural holding. Before FSS 2010, several SIRET numbers were taken together to form one holding. This rule resulted in an artificial increase in the number of holdings in 2010, but this method didn't change between FSS 2010 and FSS 2013. Furthermore, it should be noted that this method is more correct since separate FADN accounts are kept for each SIRET.

8.2.b 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.

The definition threshold used for farms has remained unchanged since 1955.

As for FSS 2010, the territories of Saint-Martin, Saint-Barthelemy and Mayotte (in Mayotte, knowledge on farm holdings was significantly incomplete and of low quality, thus it was not possible to draw a stratified sample in this department) are excluded.

Guyane territory was restricted in order to focus on professional and more accessible holdings, on the coast side : it was limited to 3 052 holdings, instead of 5 983 units surveyed by FSS 2010.

The list of Guyanese farms excluded from the coverage of FSS 2013 is in the file attached. As a consequence, data on active farms from FSS 2013 must be compared to a population of 513 173 active holdings from FSS 2010 (and not 516 104).

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.

During FSS 2010, in France, **the farmer (or holder)** was called the *responsable économique et financier* (REF). For FSS 2013, we introduced the word of *exploitant*, which means "farmer", in order to reconcile our national terminology with European concepts. The REF benefits from the operating profits and suffers any losses, and may be a natural or legal person. This change of terminology allows to be more consistent with European definitions, and has not any impact on the results.

In FSS 2010, the recording of **farm labour**, family or otherwise, was identical regardless of the farm status. In FSS2013, for the first time, we adopted Eurostat definition of the family : in the case of farms managed under legal person status (EARL, SCEA, SA, SARL or other person), co-farmers and their families who work on the farm are considered as non-family labour. This change of definitions may have had an impact of the family labour collected in 2013.

In FSS 2013, for the first time, in order to increase the use of administrative sources, bovine animals were not collected during the survey but were provided, according to the race of cows, by the national identification database (BDNI), thanks to farmers' identification numbers (EDE). The eligible bovine animals are the ones detained by the farmer on November 1st, 2013. In FSS 2010, the part of dairy cows in each farm had been asked to the farmer, and this part had been applied to the number of cows known in the BDNI for this farm on November 1st, 2010, to determine the number of dairy cows and other cows for every farm. In certain mixed races, used as well for the dairy production as for the production of meat, the breakdown between dairy cows and other ones, based on races in the BDNI, can differ from that operated by the farmer during the survey of 2010. A part of the evolutions observed on the cattle (number of dairy cows and ranking within the farmtype - characteristic A06) is thus connected to the change operated in the mode of collection. This method used for FSS 2013 is consistent with the one we are using in the framework of the animal Regulation No 1165/2008.

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.

There are no changes since FSS 2010.

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 was integrated into FSS survey for the first time in 2010. Until 2010, these areas were considered as being outside the UAA of agricultural holdings. They were identified only by the annual survey on land use. There are no changes in definition of common land since FSS 2010.

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.

Even if the definition of common lands has not changed between FSS 2010 and FSS 2013, we observe an evolution of the area owned by common land (675 128 ha in 2013 and 749 492 ha in 2010) and of agricultural holdings using common lands (1 272 holdings in 2013 and 1 410 holdings in 2010). The concept of common land was introduced for the first time in 2010. The concept was better understood in 2013, and some misunderstandings of this concept may have occurred in 2010.

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.

<i>Main characteristic</i>	FSS 2010 - Complete coverage	FSS 2010 - Restricted coverage (1)	FSS 2013 - Restricted coverage (2)	Difference in % (2)/(1)	Comments
Number of holdings	516 104	513 173	472 207	-8,0%	This drop of 8% reflects a general trend towards the expansion of agricultural holdings. Between 2010 and 2013, the total UAA is almost stable, whereas the number of agricultural holdings decreases. As a consequence, the average size of French farms increases, from 55 hectares per holding in 2010 to 60 hectares per holding in 2013 (all types of farms included, from main land and overseas departments).
Total UAA (A_3_1)	27 837 286	27 830 549	27 739 432	-0,3%	
Area under arable crops (B_1)	18 386 080	18 380 158	18 466 196	0,5%	
Permanent grassland (B_3)	8 418 877	8 418 594	8 242 242	-2,1%	
Permanent crops (B_4)	1 018 274	1 017 862	1 024 473	0,6%	
Wooded area (B_5_2)	1 003 372	1 001 413	1 046 530	4,5%	
Unused area (B_5_1)	367 459	365 193	70 902	-80,6%	The fall of unused areas is largely due to the reclassification of heath : in FSS2010, these lands were classified in unused areas. In order to be more consistent with European definition, since FSS2013, heath are classified with « Other lands (B_5_3)».
Fallow land (B_1_12_1 & B_1_12_2)	628 907	628 871	494 235	-21,4%	The drop of fallow lands is in the continuity of the previous tendency (between FSS2007 and FSS2010, fallow lands had fallen of 50.5%). >
Total LSU	22 674 167	22 673 723	21 871 298	-3,6%	
Total bovine animals (C_2)	19 506 209	19 505 812	18 905 862	-3,1%	
Number of persons in the family (E_1_1 & E_1_3)	568 048	564 649	491 791	-12,9%	
Family AWU (E_1_1 & E_1_3)	340 443	337 618	296 676	-12,1%	
Number of persons outside the family (E_1_4)	446 419	446 394	416 025	-6,8%	

Non-family AWU (E_1_4)	351 807	351 787	343 821	-2,3%	
---------------------------	---------	---------	---------	-------	--

Annexes:

[The list of Guyanese farms excluded from the 2013 FSS coverage](#)

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

In order to check data collected by FSS 2013, comparisons were made at the questionnaire level :

- with areas declared by farmers in the context of agricultural aid : this was only possible for farmers who submitted for European aids in 2013
- with data from FSS 2010, for farmers who were already in activity in 2010.

These checks were conducted during data validation stage. It made it possible to detect some errors made by investigators while recording data in CAPI (unit errors, etc...).

Extreme data (very big areas or animal numbers) were also checked by regional staff, by comparing it to data from 2013 aid application, and, in last resort, by checking directly with the farmer.

Corrections were made at this stage, on some questionnaires, but it is hard to quantify, since this operation was conducted during several weeks at regional level.

8.3.b Comparisons at macro level

After data validation at microlevel, provisional results of FSS 2013 (especially main characteristics) were compared with several sources :

- data from FSS 2010;
- data from the annual agricultural statistics (AAS). These are drawn up by each statistical service of the regional directorates for agriculture and forestry. Their data relate to the statistics on land use and agricultural production in several fields, at department level : areas, yield, quantities harvested for plants, numbers of workers, weight or average quantities and totals for animal production. Each departmental piece of data is the result of comparing and balancing data from surveys, administrative sources (subsidies, taxation, etc.), questions addressed to the Chambers of Agriculture, trade associations, producer groups, etc.
- data from external sources, mainly the areas declared by farmers in the context of agricultural aid.

These comparisons did not show any surprising or irregular changes. The work tables used were not kept.

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 statistics are entirely reconcilable with other data sources, as long as the comparison is made on the same geographical scope.

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.

A great expertise was conducted before the survey to simplify FSS 2013 questionnaire, in order to focus on collecting only data requested by Eurostat. This lightened questionnaire was submitted to several working groups :

- a committee of external users of 2013 FSS data : main directorates of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, INRA (National Institute for Agricultural Research), Permanent Assembly of the Chambers of Agriculture, professional organisations.
- a committee of regional statistic staff

These two committees were asked to give their opinion on the questionnaire. If one member wanted to add a question to it, he was asked to argue for it and to prove that the data collected by this question was not already collected by another survey.

FSS team at national level finally checked that all data collected could not be provided by another source, before validating the final questionnaire.

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.

The data may be used by researchers after approval by the confidentiality committee of the national council for statistical information. If the request is approved, the data may be accessed only via a safe access centre and the resulting tables are checked for the application of statistical confidentiality.

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 data circulates after encryption.

In the tables, data concerning fewer than three units and data where one unit represents more than 85% of the information are replaced by "s".

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.

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.

Survey timetable

The survey started with a study aiming at simplifying the questionnaire, in order to limit the cost of the survey and not to collect data that already exist in another source (see chapter 10).

Then, the survey was monitored by national FSS staff, who developed the CAPI application used for data collection.

Regional staff recruited investigators and conducted the survey at their level, relying on CAPI application.

The main stages of the survey are recapitulated in the timetable below.

Operation	Date
Review of the questionnaire, tested on several farms, and validation by users committees	August 2012 – March 2013
Writing of instructions relating to the questionnaire, and validation by users	October 2012 - July 2013
Development of the 2013 FSS CAPI	March 2013 - July 2013
Sample design	October 2012 - July 2013
Recruitment of interviewers	July - August 2013
Training of permanent regional staff	September 2013
Training of interviewers by the permanent regional agents	September - October 2013
Collection of data	October 2013 - March 2014
Checks – Data validation	January 2014 - November 2014
Preparation of files of provisional data for dissemination	October 2014 - December 2014
Weight calculation and estimation, calculation of quality indicators	November 2014 – January 2015
Validation of aggregated data and delivering data to regional services	January 2015
Preparation of files of final results for Eurostat and national dissemination	January 2015-March 2015
Data dissemination to external users	Summer 2015
First publications (4 pages)	June 2015

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

National organisation

The Service de la Statistique et de la Prospective (SSP) is responsible for designing the operation, drafting the questionnaire and the instructions, training the regional services, running the final check on the quality of the data collected and of the first published results. In the SSP, national responsibility for the survey lies with the *Sub-Directorate for Agricultural, Forestry and Agri-Food Statistics (SDSAFA)* and more specifically *the Office of Structural, Environmental and Forestry Statistics (BSSEF)*, a national unit responsible for the operation. In this office, a statistics project team is responsible for FSS 2013 (head of project only). Two persons are members of this team.

The head of BSSEF also provides a project management support.

Lastly, the general services helped to pay the interviewers employed.

Furthermore, in order to implement the various operations, a technical group was created of national and regional statisticians, to:

- finalise the questionnaires and instructions after consulting the users;
- run interview tests;
- produce the educational resources needed for interviewer training by the regional services;
- create tools for checking responses at regional and national level.

Regional organisation

The SSP has relied on its specialised departments, **the regional statistics services (NUTS2) for statistical and economic information (SRISE)** for recruiting and training interviewers, plan and monitor the work of the interviewers, the data collection and first-level validation, and publish regional results when the survey is declared validated.

In the field, data collection is carried out by specialised units of the Ministry of Agriculture, i.e. the 26 regional services (NUTS2). They carry out survey-related tasks in the field via the network of interviewers employed for the entire agricultural statistics survey programme and through the recruitment of additional interviewers for FSS 2013. 3 000 interviewers took part in the collection.



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.

Data validation was longer than expected, because of several reasons :

- FSS 2013 was one the first surveys conducted on a CAPI application which was entirely developed by the national statistic project team. Previous SSP surveys had experienced some slowness and heaviness in its CAPI application, due to the fact that the device was quite new. Therefore, most of the interviewers and regional statistic services were really expecting an efficient and reactive application for FSS2013, especially given the length of the questionnaire. That is why the project team decided to design the CAPI application in a way that simplifies data collection and limit the duration of interviews. This approach was appreciated by interviewers, regional staff and farmers. To do so, the number of automatic controls run by the CAPI application during the interview were more limited than during 2010 FSS, which made the application quicker and more reactive. The main inconvenient

of this method is that more errors could be captured in the application without any warning message. As a consequence, in order to ensure a good quality of data, checks had to be more consistent and lasted much more longer than expected. For FSS 2016, the project team intends to add more controls in the CAPI application, in order to better manage the validation stage ;

- The new way of sample design, relying on two data bases (2010 FSS and SIRENE register), made the extrapolation much more complicated.

12.1. Source data

12.1.a Target population

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.

As has been the case since 1955, the definition of agricultural holding used in France is that set out in Regulation (EC) No 1166/2008.

The agricultural holding is defined, for the purpose of agricultural statistics, as an economic and production unit which meets all three of the following conditions:

- its activity is agricultural in nature,
- it is subject to independent everyday management,
- it is of a certain size or larger (area, number of animals, production, etc.) according to the thresholds defined in the tables presented in item 12.1.a.3.

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 non applicable in France (please see 12.1.a.4).

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 FSS 2013 covers the entire scope of the EU Regulation.

The general threshold is 1 hectare of UAA, except for certain types of specialised production, where it is lower:

- the threshold is 20 ares for the following crops :
 - hop,
 - tobacco,
 - aromatic, medicinal and culinary plants
 - vegetable, floral, fodder or industrial seeds
 - fresh vegetables, melons and strawberries outdoor - openfield
 - floral and ornamental crops
 - permanent crops (vineyards, orchards, berry plantations)
 - tree nurseries (B_4_5) : wine-producing, ornamental, orchard, forestry.
- If the holding does not own at least 1 ha of UAA or is not over the previous thresholds, the survey covers units that have :

Mainland France:

... or which produced at least the following over the 2012 - 2013 agricultural

at least:	production year:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 male breeder used regularly: stallion, donkey, bull, ram, boar, billygoat, etc. • 1 brood or mule mare • 1 cow (C_2_6 + C_2_99) • 2 bovine animals over the age of two years (C_2_4 + C_2_5) • 1 breeding sow (C_4_2) • a fattening house or breeding house for cattle, pigs, etc. • 6 breeding ewes (C_3_1_1) • 6 breeding nanny-goats (C_3_2_1) • 10 breeding doe rabbits (C_6) • 100 laying hens (all species) (C_5_2) • an incubation capacity of 1 000 eggs • 10 working beehives (C_7) • a fur farm breeding, for example, mink, coypu, chinchillas, goats and angora rabbits • a game farm producing game for slaughter or sale, excluding hunting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 horses for slaughter • 5 battery calves • 5 pigs (C_4) • 10 sheep for slaughter (C_3_1_99) • 10 goats for slaughter (C_3_2_99) • 200 rabbits for meat • 500 fattening poultry (all species) (C_5_1 + C_5_3) • 50 rick poultry • 10 000 eggs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 ares of asparagus • 20 ares of cabbage for sauerkraut • 15 ares of strawberries • 5 ares for market gardening (not intended only for own consumption) (B_1_7_1_2) • 5 ares of flower or ornamental crops (B_1_8) • 10 ares of vineyard producing protected designation of origin (PDO) wines (<i>appellation d'origine protégée</i>, formerly "AOC" [<i>appellation d'origine contrôlée</i>]) • 10 ares of various crops under greenhouses or high cover (except tree nurseries) (B_1_7_2 + B_1_8_2) • 5 ares of champagne vineyards • 5 ares of tree nurseries (B_4_5) : wine-producing, ornamental, orchard, forestry • 40 fruit trees standing alone, for production purposes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 tons of chicory • 1 ton of mushrooms (B_6_1) • cress for sale.
In the overseas departments: at least:	...or which have been farmed over the 2012 - 2013 production year at least:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 male breeder used regularly: stallion, donkey, bull, ram, boar, billygoat, etc. • 1 brood or mule mare • 1 cow (C_2_6 + C_2_99) • 2 bovine animals over the age of two years (C_2_4 + C_2_5) • 1 breeding sow (C_4_2) • 6 breeding ewes (C_3_1_1) • 6 breeding nanny-goats (C_3_2_1) • 10 breeding doe rabbits (C_6) • 50 laying hens (all species) (C_5_2) • an incubation capacity of 1 000 eggs • 10 working beehives (C_7) • a fur farm breeding, for example, mink, coypu, chinchillas, goats and angora rabbits • a game farm producing game for slaughter or sale, excluding hunting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 horses for slaughter • 5 battery calves • 3 pigs • 10 sheep for slaughter (C_3_1_99) • 10 goats for slaughter (C_3_2_99) • 200 rabbits for meat • 200 broilers (all species) (C_5_1) • 100 rick poultry (C_5_3) • 10 000 eggs

- 10 ares of export variety bananas
- 10 ares of pineapple or other semi-permanent crops of fruit (passion fruit, etc.)
- 10 ares of sugar cane
- 10 ares of various crops under greenhouses or high cover (excluding tree nurseries) (B_1_7_2 + B_1_8_2)
- 5 ares geranium, vetiver, pepper, vanilla, etc.
- 10 ares vineyard producing protected designation of origin (PDO) wines (*appellation d'origine protégée*], formerly "AOC" [*appellation d'origine contrôlée*])
- 5 ares of fresh vegetables under vegetable or flower crop rotation (not intended for own consumption) (B_1_7_1_2)
- 5 ares of flowers or ornamental crops (B_1_8)
- 5 ares of tree nurseries: winegrowing, ornamental, orchard, forestry (B_4_5)
- 20 fruit trees standing alone, for production purposes

- 2 tons of chicory
- 1 ton of mushrooms (C_6_1)
- Cress for sale.

Holdings with at least 1000 poultry or ten bovine animals are covered.

The geographical scope is mainland France and four overseas departments: Guadeloupe, Martinique, Guyana and Réunion. In Guyana, 2 931 farms are excluded from the geographical scope since, there are less representative of Guyana agriculture, and collecting data in this area is very expensive.

In the French overseas departments, the territories of Saint-Martin, Saint-Barthélemy and Mayotte are excluded.

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).

Population from the SSP national register (units investigated by FSS 2010):

- 516 104 active farms were surveyed by FSS 2010 and constitute the total active farming population known for sure in SSP national database. Out of this total, 2 931 Guyanese farms were excluded of 2013 FSS scope. As a consequence, 513 173 active units from FSS 2010 are in the scope used for 2013 FSS.
- As a matter of fact, 2 663 vacant units from 2010 FSS also enter in the scope of FSS 2013, since they could have started their production between 2010 and 2013. Thus, the global population of farms from FSS 2010, used for designing FSS 2013 sample, contains 515 836 units.

Population from SIRENE register (it is the business register), that is to say units created between 2010 and 2013:

- A list of 53 977 holdings created from 2010 was constituted, using SIRENE register, in order to take into account, in FSS 2013, the new units created since FSS 2010.

Finally, the global population concerned by FSS 2013 is 569 813 farms. But, for doing comparisons between 2010 and 2013, only active farms from FSS 2010 (513 173 units) are taken into account (as in 8.2.f).

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.

There are no differences between the national coverage and the coverage of the records sent to Eurostat.

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*).

About 569 813 holdings were included in the population list of units. Out of these, 62 421 were selected in the sample. During the survey, only 52 793 questionnaires were collected (the other questionnaires correspond to farms that have disappeared, stopped their production, changed of farmer, or units that have no farming activity).

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.

About 82 units surveyed by FSS 2013 have a standard output (SO) equal to zero. Among them :

- 49 units are holdings with only fallow lands kept in good agricultural and environmental conditions ;
- 30 units produce endives (chicons);
- 1 unit is a hatchery (eligible but its poultry animals can't be collected);
- 3 units raise pheasants and partridges for hunting purposes.

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.

The definition thresholds used for farms are lower than the ones proposed by the European regulation.

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.

The survey was conducted in the form of a survey of a sample, in a single run for all the variables provided for in the Regulation, the FSS and OGA (Agricultural Insurance Organisation).

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 basic list was created using the:

- SSP farm register (SSP database),
- the SIRENE register (business register).

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.

It is a combination of two list frames (see above).

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

We used data from :

- SSP farm register, which contains units investigated in 2010 by FSS2010, and updated by surveys conducted by French SSP between 2010 and 2013

SIRENE register which contains the list of new units created between 2010, February 1st and 2013, June 30th.

12.1.d Sampling design

Section 12.1.d should be completed only in case of a sample survey.

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.

A stratified sampling design was used. We actually are in the case of a probability design.

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.

The sampling design is a single-stage design.

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.

Sampling units are holdings in a 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.

We distinguish the stratification of units from SSP farm register, and units from the SIRENE register (business register). Concerning units from SSP farm register : the stratification is based on departments, farm type, standard output, and the production of organic products (whether farms are committed in organic farming or not). Concerning units from SIRENE register : the stratification is based on departments, the type of activity (known in SIRENE register), and the UAA if this characteristic is known before the survey (ie. if the unit could be found in the 2013 aid application thanks to its SIRET identification number).

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.

For units from SSP farm register, we used a balanced sampling method, based on standard output.

For units from SIRENE register, since farms standard output wasn't known, we used a simple random sampling in each stratum.

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).

The full coverage stratum contains :

- units which standard output is above 1 500 000 euros
- units with 50 permanent salaried people or more
- units which produce 50 tons of mushrooms or more
- units investigated by 2012 FADN (Farm Accountancy Data Network)
- units which produce 300 tons of endives (chicons) or more
- atypical units by size (the size criteria depends on the region and the production considered).

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.

Size was determined in order to get a RSE on standard output, by department (NUTS3), under 3%.
The sample was allocated by a Neyman allocation, using the standard output for calculating the standard deviation.

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.

The previous FSS, conducted in 2010, was a national and exhaustive census.
FSS 2013 is the first sample FSS conducted since 2010 : a new sample was designed.

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

SAS software was used.

12.1.d.10 other relevant information, if any

We have nothing else to mention.

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.

The following administrative sources were used:

- 1) **Area declarations made by farmers** when applying for CAP aids, between April 2nd and May 15th (2013): this source was only used to initialize questionnaires. The interviewers could change the data according to the farmer declaration during the face to face interview. This source is updated each year, according to the European calendar for CAP declarations.
- 2) **The Base de Données Nationale d'Identification (BDNI, national identification database)** : this source provided bovine animals detained by farmers of the survey sample, on the reference date of 2013, November 1st. This source is daily updated by farmers' declarations they are committed to make each time they get new bovine animals or they sell ones.
- 3) **The files from the Agence de Services et de Paiement (ASP, Services and Payment agency)** responsible for paying the rural development aids. These files are updated each year, when farmers ask for these aids.

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 definition is the same for each source. It is exactly the one that appears in the Article 2 of the Council Regulation (EC) No 73/2009.

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

Purpose	Administrative source <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>
	<p>Administrative information on bovine livestock, was used to fill the questionnaire concerning bovine animals, using farmers' administrative identification numbers (identifier EDE).</p> <p>The Base de Données Nationale d'Identification (BDNI) This database was used to obtain information on bovine herds. This allowed a standardised description of the bovine population held by farmers on 2013 November 1st. The farmer's identifier (EDE) was initialized in the questionnaire, and could be modified or collected during the survey. All the information on the age of the cattle is</p>

<p>- 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></p>	<p>included in the BDNI. Only the distinction between dairy cattle and suckler cows is not made. This distinction is established from the breed of each animal.</p> <p>The dairy breeds are: ABONDANCE, ARMORICAINE, OTHER FOREIGN MILKING BREEDS, AYRSHIRE, BLEUE DU NORD, BORDELAISE, BRETONNE PIE NOIRE, BRUNE, BUFFLE, CANADIENNE, DAIRY SHORTHORN, FERRANDAISE, FROMENT DU LEON, GUERNESEY, JERSEY, MONTBELIARDE, NORMANDE, PIE ROUGE DES PLAINES , PRIM' HOLSTEIN, ROUGE FLAMANDE, SIMMENTAL FRANCAISE, TARENTEISE, VILLARD DE LANS, VOSGIENNE.</p> <p>The suckler breeds are: ANGUS, AUBRAC, AUROCHS RECONSTITUE, OTHER FOREIGN SUCKLER BREEDS, BAZADAISE, BEARNAISE, BISON, BLANC BLEU, BLONDE D'AQUITAINE, BRAHMA, CASTA (AURE and ST GIRONS), CHAROLAISE, CHIANINA, CORSE, CREOLE, CROISE, DE COMBAT (ESPAGNOLE BRAVA), GALLOWAY, GASCONNE, GELBVIEH, HEREFORD, HERENS, HIGHLAND CATTLE, INRA 95, LIMOUSINE, LOURDAISE, MARAICHINE, MARCHIGIANA, MIRANDAISE (GASCONNE AREOLEE), N' DAMA, NANTAISE, PARTHENAISE, PIEMONTAISE, UNKNOWN BREED, RAÇO DI BIOU (CAMARGUE), ROUGE DES PRES, SALERS, SAOSNOISE, SOUTH DEVON.</p> <p>The files from the Agence de Services et de Paiement (ASP, services and payment agency)</p> <p>Data on rural development aid over the last three years have been calculated on the basis of these files. The identifier used was the SIRET (identifier from SIRENE register which is used in each French declaration for aid).</p>
<p>- to replace the survey on all characteristics and on a part of the survey population</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>- 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></p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>- to build/update the (sampling) frame (used for census or for sample survey)</p>	<p>The SSP farm register, for units from FSS 2010 and the ones surveyed by SSP since (this is not an exhaustive list of units created since 2010)</p> <p>The SIRENE register (business register) to complete the list of units created since 2010 and which doesn't already exist in SSP database. The aid application (based on area declarations in 2013) was also used to complete data of these new units (in particular UAA).</p>
<p>- to pre-fill answers in the questionnaires which are then checked by farmers during the survey</p>	<p>Area declarations made by farmers when applying for aid.</p> <p>These declared areas were used to initialize responses: the farmer simply had to confirm them or possibly amend or complete them. This then made it possible</p>

	reduce the interview time spent on area enquiries. The farmer's identifier in relation to aid was verified during the interview.
- to impute item/unit non-response	No imputation from an administrative source was used.
- to validate the survey data (quality control). <i>Please indicate actions taken in case of large discrepancies</i>	Administrative information on areas receiving aid was used for checking the data.
- to calibrate of survey estimates. <i>Please indicate the calibration variables</i>	n/a
- other (<i>please specify in the next column</i>)	n/a

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.

Information on bovine herds could be provided by BDNI (French System for the Identification and Registration of Bovine Animals, see 12.1.e.3), only if the farmer had given his identification number (EDE). In some cases, even if the farmer owns bovines, he can have mentioned an erroneous identification number, and the extraction from BDNI database could not be made. As a consequence, bovine herds can somehow be underestimated, compared to data from FSS 2010.

Concerning rural development characteristics, data from ASP is exhaustive.

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>
-coverage:		
	- over-coverage <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>	Nothing to mention.
	- under-coverage <i>If the source covers less units than it should,</i>	There may be some under-coverage of bovine herds

<i>please provide an assessment of the extent of under-coverage (if possible) and mention if and how the missing information is derived.</i>	due to the quality of EDE identification numbers (see 12.1.e.4).
- misclassification <i>Please mention whether the information allows for the requested classification of units and whether there are errors in classification variables.</i>	The only misclassification that can appear concerns the distinction between dairy cows and other cows : the BDNI (French system for the Identification and Registration of Bovine Animals) distinction is based on the breed of the animal (see 12.1.e.3). Thus, it does not take into account the particularity of mixing breeds, ie breeds of cows that can indifferently belong to dairy or suckler cattle, depending on the farm type and the region.
- multiple listings <i>Please provide an assessment on units which were present more than once in the source and specify how the duplicates were eliminated.</i>	There should not be such units.
- rate of unreported events <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>	Nothing to mention.
- missing data (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>	There are no missing data.
- errors in register variables (analogue to measurement errors in a survey) i.e. erroneous values for certain variables	The only errors that can appear would be due to erroneous identification numbers, but it is hard to measure.
- processing errors. <i>Please provide an assessment. You can mention here imputation methods used, if any.</i>	There are no processing errors that we know of.
- coherence (comparison to other available data) of the administrative data (ex-ante and/or ex-post)	No surprising incoherence was detected.
- other drawbacks (if any) of the use of data from the administrative source. <i>Please specify the drawbacks in the next column.</i>	Nothing to mention.

[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.

Between 2010 and 2020, FSS data is collected in 2013 and in 2016.

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.

The FSS 2013 was conducted entirely by computer-assisted personal interviewing (CAPI) on touch screen table PCs (Stylus).

An interview lasted between 10 minutes and three hours.

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.

The CAPI interface was used to record responses, check their plausibility and send files to a central server (3G network).

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.

When an interviewer was confronted with a first refusal, he/she had to inform the competent regional service, which tried to obtain a response. This procedure made it possible to solve most cases of refusal.

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.	<p>Number of holdings in the population covered by the records sent to Eurostat <i>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 $1=3+4+5$</i></p>	569 813 units.
2.	<p>Number of holdings in the gross sample <i>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 $2=3+4+5$</i></p>	62 421 units.
3.	<p>(new) Number of ineligible holdings <i>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.</i></p>	7851 units (among them, 676 units are active units but with non farming activities).
3.1	<p>Number of holdings with ceased activities <i>This item is a subset of 3. $3.1 \geq 3.1.1 + 3.1.2$</i></p>	7175 units.
3.1.1	<p>Number of holdings which definitively ceased i.e. the land is abandoned. <i>This item should be completed only if information is available.</i></p>	2839 units.
3.1.2	<p>Number of holdings with ceased activities following the change of manager <i>This item should be completed only if information is available.</i></p>	4329 units.
4	<p>(new) Number of holdings with unknown eligibility status <i>The number of surveyed holdings which could not be contacted (e.g. in a CATI survey) and for which it is not certain if they are eligible (e.g. in scope) or not.</i></p>	1263 units could not be contacted.
5	<p>(new) Number of eligible holdings <i>The number of surveyed holdings which are eligible $5=5.1+5.2$</i></p>	53307. Among them, 514 units refused to take part in the survey and were not imputed. As a consequence, the data submitted to Eurostat contains 52793 units (52760 respondents + 33 imputed).
5.1	<p>Number of non-responding holdings <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;</p>	547 units.

	- participated in the survey but the entire survey form cannot be used because of poor quality etc. This item refers to holdings for which no data is collected (unit non-response). 5.1>=5.1.1+5.1.2	
5.1.1	Number of non-responding holdings – re-weighted	514 units.
5.1.2	Number of non-responding holdings – imputed	33 units.
5.2	Number of responding holdings <i>This item includes holdings which provided completed questionnaires, either entirely or partially.</i>	52 760 units.

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.

Three different questionnaires were prepared:

- mainland France + questions of regional interest,
- overseas departments excluding Guyana (Guadeloupe, Martinique and Réunion),
- Guyana.

[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

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.

All the absolute coherence controls were programmed in the CAPI interface.

- The CAPI interface involved controls to ensure that all the variables had been established.
- Furthermore, coherence controls in some variables, and between variables, were performed during the interview in order for corrections to be made by the farmer himself via his dialogue with the interviewer. The aim was to check the values in relation to the maximum national levels already identified in FSS 2010, and to check the consistency between the various parts of the questionnaire. These controls may be defined as "major" if correction was required, or "minor" if they constituted alerts. Questionnaires involving major controls cannot be transmitted to the central server by the interviewer unless this is specifically requested. In such cases, the regional service must correct the ongoing anomaly, possibly by asking the farmer to provide additional information.

- Additional controls on individual data were run during and after data collection, by updating daily 13 files and delivering it to regional services. They focused on :

- examination of the maximum values at NUTS2 level;
- examination of questionnaires closed without a face-to-face interview : in particular, if the respondent reported having stopped his production, the regional team checked whether he had submitted a CAP declaration during the campaign (using the PACAGE identification number, if available). Further more, if the respondent indicates that the farm owner had changed, the regional team checked the administrative change of owner, via the SIRET identification number (if available);
- verification of the accuracy of the administrative identification number, such as PACAGE, SIRENE, EDE, using the administrative sources.

- examination of the coherence between several parts of the questionnaire, by running controls that were not designed in the CAPI interface.

Potential irregularities were pointed out to the regional service, which contacted the interviewer, who had to remind the farmer to check his/her responses.

- Control of aggregated data, at regional level and central level.

Two files were daily updated and delivered to regional staff. The aim was to compare the results for the main variables with data from FSS 2010, in order to check whether any major errors remained.

The work threw some light on a number of residual inconsistencies and allowed the necessary corrections.

The technical note, delivered by the national team in charge of FSS 2013, to regional services, is available (in French) in annex.

12.4.b Tools used for data validation

Please mention tools used.

Regional services (see 12.4.c) could use 15 files which were updated each day, during and after data collection, in order to check survey data. The tool used was SPSS software, and generated files in EXCEL or Calc format. This tool could be used to obtain inventories, ratios and lists. All these controls were used at NUTS 2 and national level. These checks are used to monitor outliers, the systematic application of standards by an interviewer, errors not detected in the capture/control programme, and failure to comply with instructions.

Main functions used:

- verification of "forced" checks during collection in order to identify any systematic errors;
- list of the X biggest values for each quantitative variable, making it possible to identify outliers.

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.

Controls by interviewers

On-site controls refer to coherence control done by CAPI interface (see 12.4.a).

Control by regional staff

The regional manager of the statistical service checked the work of all the interviewers, by calling farmers back in a poll to check that the interviewer had indeed conducted the interview, and also how they had gone about it.

They also used the daily updated files described in 12.4.a on the data arriving on the central server.

They performed regional-level controls of aggregate data (see 12.4.a) which are a means of improving the quality of the results.

Control by central staff

They performed the same type of aggregate data control in order to ensure that no unsettled problems remained (see 12.4.a).

Annexes:

[The data validation procedure applied at regional level.](#)

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.

In each stratum, design weights are : the size of the population in the stratum by the size of the sample in the stratum.

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.

We applied re-weighting for non response with response homogeneity groups (farm type, SO, NUTS2 region)

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.

Calibration was used for the sample from the SSP farm register : respondent sampling is calibrated on data from SSP farm register, by NUTS3 department, SO and UAA.

No calibration was used for the sample from the SIRENE register.

12.5.a.4 Any other applied adjustment of weights

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

81 units were detected with extreme value of UAA : they were put in the exhaustive stratum with a coefficient equal to one.

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:

[The 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.

There is nothing special to mention.

13.b Possible improvements in the future

Please suggest possible improvements.

A particular attention will be given to validation stage, in order to check data and validate it in a better delay, and to deliver final results by the target date. To do so, CAPI application should contain more absolute coherence controls. As a matter of fact, data validation should begin earlier, since the beginning of data collection, indeed.

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).

n/a

Related metadata

[Top](#)

Annexes

[Top](#)