

## 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. Hungarian Central Statistical Office (HCSO)

Time Dimension: 2013-A0

Data Provider: HU1

Data Flow: FSS\_ESQRS\_A:1.0



### Eurostat metadata

#### Reference metadata

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

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

[Download](#)

### 1. Contact

[Top](#)

<b>1.1. Contact organisation</b>	<p><i>Please provide the name of the organisation of the contact points for the data or metadata.</i></p> <p>Hungarian Central Statistical Office (HCSO)</p>
<b>1.2. Contact organisation unit</b>	<p><i>Please specify an addressable subdivision of an organisation.</i></p> <p>Rural Development, Agricultural and Environmental Statistics Department (RAESD)</p>
<b>1.5. Contact mail address</b>	<p><i>Please specify the postal address of the contact points for the data or metadata.</i></p> <p>Keleti Károly utca 5-7. HU-1024 Budapest</p>

### 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 first agricultural census was implemented in Hungary in 1895 followed by censuses in 1935, 1956-1957, 1972, 1981 and 1991. Agricultural Census 2000 was the first one compliant with the relevant EU regulations. Before accession to the European Union Farm Structure Survey 2003 was carried out in line with the EU regulations. Hungary as an EU Member State implemented Farm Structure Survey (FSS) in 2005, 2007, 2010 and 2013.

In case of censuses an Act provides the legal background, while interim surveys are part of the annual data collection system which is a Government Decree.

Agricultural enterprises are part of the business register of HCSO updated continuously with data transmitted from the Registry Court.

The register of private holdings updated fully on the basis of censuses and partly when interim surveys are carried out. For the implementation of FSSs the combination of exhaustive and sample survey is used. Agricultural enterprises (units with legal entity) always observed on full scope while regarding private holdings (units without legal entity) surveys are carried out on full scope or representative basis. From 2013 agricultural enterprises have to report their agricultural activity via internet, in case of private holdings enumerators make mainly face-to-face interviews or part of them provide data electronically or by mail. The seven Regional Departments (NUTS 2 level) of the HCSO and County Sections (NUTS 3) belonging to them are involved in the implementation under the management of the Rural Development Agricultural and Environmental Statistics Department (RAESD).

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

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

- the reference of the national legal base of the FSS survey (Act, Government Decree, etc.)	The Act XLVI of 1993 on Statistics provides the general regulatory framework of surveys implemented in Hungary. Interim farm structure surveys are included in the yearly National Program of Statistical Data Collection (NPSDC) which is a Government Decree, whereas censuses are ruled by an Act approved by the Parliament.
- the scope and the coverage of the survey	See 12.1.a.1
- the frequency and the reference period of the survey	In every 10 year a census is carried out in Hungary. Between the censuses FSS was implemented in 2003, 2005, 2007 and 2013. The reference date of the FSS 2013 was 1 <sup>st</sup> June 2013, except for the followings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Machinery and equipment: 12 months preceeding the day of survey;</li> <li>• Farm labour force: 12 months ending on the reference day of the survey.</li> </ul>
- the responsibility for the survey	The Hungarian Central Statistical Office is responsible for carry out FSS.
- the administrative and financial provisions	The total budget of the FSS 2013 was 2 966 486 Euro of which 1 million (33,7%) was financed by the European Union, the rest from national budget.
- the obligations of the respondents with respect to the survey	The respondents are liable to provide adequate data; in case of refusal legal action are to be entailed. Data had to be provided by internet (HCSO ELEKTRA system) in case of agricultural enterprises which is a legal obligation according to the Government Decree 279/2012.
- the identification, protection and obligations of survey enumerators	Under the Criminal Law enumerators are considered and are entitled to be protected as official person. The HCSO had issued registered identification badges valid only for the duration of the survey together with the ID card.
- the right of access to administrative data	HCSO is authorized for using administrative data sources listed in the act of agricultural census (XXVII of 2010) and has legal possibility to access them. In case of FSS 2013 based on the good connection created with them during FSS 2010 a contract was signed between HCSO and the relevant organisations.
- confidentiality provisions	In virtue of the Act CXII of 2011 on Informational Self-Determination and on Freedom of Information and the Act XLVI of 1993 on Statistics all individual data are qualified as confidential and are treated as such. Survey data are validated and checked exclusively by the staff of HCSO and enumerators are responsible for preventing unauthorized access to the completed questionnaires.

## 3. Quality management - assessment

[Top](#)

[Not requested]

## 4. Relevance

[Top](#)

Restricted for publication

### 4.1. Relevance - User Needs

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

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

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

Main group	National characteristics surveyed	Users
Land use	Renting prices and quality of land area by location, purchasing and selling price of land area	HCSO for EAA, government organisations, private users
	More detailed observation of arable area not used	HCSO for the production of crop supply balance sheets
	More detailed breakdown of fruits by species	Agricultural government organisations, research institutions and universities
Livestock production	More detailed observation of livestock	Agricultural government organisations, research institutions and universities
	Change in livestock, home slaughtering	HCSO for the production of livestock supply balance sheets and for EAA
Buildings and machinery	More detailed breakdown of machineries and equipments	Agricultural government organisations, research institutions and universities
Other information	More detailed observation of indicators on rural development	Agricultural government organisations, research institutions and universities
	Agricultural services provided	HCSO for EAA
Labour force	Agricultural qualification of each person belonging to the private holding	HCSO to ensure comparability with previous data

#### 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.

Main group	National characteristics surveyed	Periods/dates
Land use	Characteristics in general	Data related to land use was collected as of 31 May 2013
	Renting prices and quality of land area	2013
	More detailed observation of arable area not used	31 May 2013
	More detailed breakdown of fruits by species	31 May 2013
	Purchasing and selling price of land area	12 month period ending on 31 May 2013
	Livestock in general	Data related to livestock was collected as of 1 June 2013
Livestock production	More detailed observation of livestock	1 June 2013
	Change in livestock, home slaughtering	1 January 2013–1 June 2013
		Ownership: 1 June 2013

<b>Buildings and machinery</b>	More detailed breakdown of machineries and equipments by ownership and by uses	Uses: 12 month period ending on 31 May 2013
	More detailed observation of indicators on rural development	12 month period ending on 31 May 2013
<b>Other information</b>		
	Agricultural services provided or required	12 month period ending on 31 May 2013
	Characteristics in general	12 month period ending on 31 May 2013
<b>Labour force</b>		
	Agricultural qualification of each person belonging to the private holding	1 June 2013
	Characteristics in general	Previous 3 years (2010-2012)
<b>Rural development</b>		
	More detailed observation of indicators on rural development	12 month preceding the referenced day of survey
	Agricultural services provided or required	12 month period ending on 31 May 2013

#### 4.2. Relevance - User Satisfaction

[Not requested]

#### 4.3. Completeness

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

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

The overall answer to this item should provide information on:

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

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

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

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

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

- The observed FSS characteristics were specified according to the Commission Regulation No 1166/2008 Annex III. and Annex V. All characteristics were included into the FSS 2013 questionnaires except those ones which are non-existing in Hungary.
- Crops reported as NE are not produced in Hungary due to the climatic conditions while the share of not significant crops in the total production is low. The production of genetically modified crops is not allowed in Hungary.
- Non-existent characteristics is marked with '0'
- Data of not significant characteristics reported in the data set.
- For determination of NS crops the share of the area of the crop concerned in the total area and the share in total output within EAA was calculated.

Code	Crop	% of UAA	% specific crop's output
1.03.02.03.04	Sugar beet (excluding seed)	0,000%	-
1.03.02.03.11	Vineyards	0,026%	-
2.01.01.07	Rice	0,058%	0,030%
2.01.06.02	Hops	0,000%	0,000%
2.01.06.09	Flax	0,000%	0,000%

2.01.06.10	Hemp	0,000%	0,000%
2.04.07	Permanent crops under glass	-	0,000%

[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.)

- **Sampling error**

In case of private holdings a sample survey was carried out, thus sampling error occurred. The relative standard errors for all main characteristics fulfilled the precision requirements.

- **Non-sampling error**

During the survey and validation process we tried to reduce the effects of non-sampling errors as much as possible. Therefore the importance of non-sampling error – apart from non-response error – was negligible. There was no significant step taken because of this reason. Non-response error was corrected by imputation.

### 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.

Formulae applied for estimation methods is provided in the annex.

#### Annexes:

[Method used for estimation of standard error](#)

[Applicability 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.

We have RSE's under 5% limit for all considered variables and almost all expected characteristics. But we missed the expected threshold in case of other bovine animals in HU 10 and in case of other pigs In HU22 (even only with a few tenths of a percent). According to the preliminary results of the designed sample the variance of the above mentioned characteristics were below the limit. The calculated RSE based on the collected data was slightly higher than expected.

## Annexes:

[Relative standard errors](#)

### 5.3. Non-sampling error

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

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

#### Assessment of possible bias

*If comparison with another source or consistency study is made, please give a **brief** description of the source used and the differences observed which can be proof of bias.*

*(new) Please also consider here bias risks associated with non-response by assessing the distribution of non-response across holdings' categories.*

#### Private holdings

- The rate of non-response amounted to 0,3%.
- The item non-response was negligible as during the face-to-face interviews the appropriate tables of the questionnaires have been completed by the enumerator.

#### Agricultural enterprises

- From 2013 agricultural enterprises report their agricultural activity by internet which is a legal requirement (Government Decree 279/2012 (IX.28)). As many validation rules as possible were incorporated into the online questionnaire. The questionnaire could sent to HCSO by respondents until it fitted to the validation rules.
- Enterprises not involved in agricultural production in 2013 did not complete the questionnaire but sent it back with a comment regarding the reason. The unit non response rate was 12 % in 2013 decreased by 7% from 2010 when questionnaires were sent back to HCSO mainly in paper form. These enterprises did not carry out agricultural production or their production was not important.

### 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 a bias in the estimates. If possible please, please provide an assessment on the extent of under-coverage.*

A separated stratum for the private holdings having significant agricultural activity (key private holdings) was created, and some holdings reclassified from the private holdings to key farms during the survey in the sampled area. They are handled as being observed exhaustively (without projection factor). Undercoverage have been reduced by use of administrative sources.

#### 5.3.1.b Over-coverage

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

Units which do not belong to the target population were not measured, so no over-coverage error occurred.

#### 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 missclassification errors and how they were addressed.*

The center of the holding (address) and the major activity of the holding could be in different enumeration area. We did not change their allocation to strata.

#### 5.3.1.d Contact errors

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

In those cases when the contact was not successfull imputation was made (see 5.3.4.c)



**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 duplication were eliminated.*

No significant, but they were handled by the surveyors during the survey. We didn't modify the design weights.

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

NA

**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).*

27.33 per cent

**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.*

**Respondent:** Some respondent provided data in wrong unit of measurement, e.g. in not SI unit (International System of Units) of measurement.

Some data provider (especially older people) can use non-SI measurement unit – e. g. acres for Agricultural Area – and respondents give some information in this way. In those cases, the enumerator had to change them to SI-unit.

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

Not available.

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

Re-interviews were carried out in 1% of the sample by local staff of the HCSO. The questionnaires were entered into the database. Evaluation was made between the original and re-interviewed questionnaires. The qualification and extra payment of the surveyors were based on the result of the evaluation.

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

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

The ratio of unit non response was negligible (0,4%).

Unit non-response rate was calculated based on enumerators' reports. 224 units were imputed the rest were untreated.

**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 completeness was ensured with the help of a check list on the last page of the questionnaire.

**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).*

0,4%

**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.*

Not applicable.

#### 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.*

All the data entry applications were developed by the IT Department in the framework of uniform Data Entry and Validation System run by the Central Statistical Office. As many validation rules as possible were incorporated to the data entry application such as logical and arithmetical coherency within and between tables, both in case of electronic and traditional data entry.

Four categories of error levels were handled during data entry phase as follows: (1) less serious errors only for information; (2) errors can be accepted, but justification is needed; (3) only authorized survey administrators can accept serious errors; (4) unacceptable errors must be corrected immediately, the data entry only can be carried on after correction.

Data on the number of corrections were not collected during data processing.

##### 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.*

Follow-up interviews were made. In case of outliers, suspicious cases follow-up interviews were carried out in order to check, correct, confirm the data.

##### 5.3.4.c Imputation methods

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

224 holdings were imputed based on the information of IACS. We used information only for the existence of the holding from IACS and imputed all possible information from the December survey.

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

Control was carried out during the survey period by supervisors, area agents and local staff of HCSO while in data processing period by local and central staff of HCSO.

#### 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.*

Imputation was applied for 224 non-response units and those holdings which were added to database in December based on December survey.

#### 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 model was used.

#### 5.3.6. Data revision

-

#### 5.3.6.1. Data revision - policy

##### Brief description of the revision policy

No data revision policy was applied in case of FSS.

#### 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.*

Not applicable

#### 5.3.6.3. Data revision - average size

[Not requested]

#### 5.3.7. Seasonal adjustment

[Not requested]

## 6. Timeliness and punctuality

[Top](#)



-
<b>6.1. Timeliness</b>
See below
<b>6.1.1. Time lag - first result</b>
<i>Please indicate the number of months from the last day of the reference period to the day of publication of first results.</i>
Time lag first results: t+7 months
<b>6.1.2. Time lag - final result</b>
<i>Please indicate the number of months from the last day of the reference period to the day of publication of complete and final results.</i>
Time lag final results: t+13 months
<b>6.2. Punctuality</b>
See below
<b>6.2.1. Punctuality - delivery and publication</b>
<i>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.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First result: t+0</li> <li>• Final results: t+0</li> </ul>

## 7. Accessibility and clarity

[Top](#)

-																				
<b>7.1. Dissemination format - News release</b>																				
[Not requested]																				
<b>7.2. Dissemination format - Publications</b>																				
<b>Regular and ad-hoc publications in which data are made available to the public</b>																				
<b>7.2.a The nature of publications</b>																				
<i>Please specify the nature of publications. For example, the publications can contain preliminary results or final results, can be technical reports, etc.</i>																				
<i>Please also specify if the publications contain metadata.</i>																				
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Title of publication</th> <th>Internet</th> <th>Date</th> <th>Content</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Agriculture in Hungary, 2013, preliminary data</td> <td>X</td> <td>January 2014</td> <td>Number of holdings, land use and sown area, type of farm, purpose of production, livestock, farm labour force, agricultural buildings and machineries and equipments. NUTS 2 level.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agriculture in Hungary, 2013 final data</td> <td>X</td> <td>July 2014</td> <td>Number of holdings, Standard Output value, land use, agricultural production methods, livestock, farm labour force, agricultural buildings and machineries, non agricultural activities in the holding. NUTS 3 level.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agricultural buildings and machineries by age groups</td> <td>X</td> <td>September 2014</td> <td>Agricultural buildings and machineries by age groups and legal form</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agriculture in Hungary, FSS 2013</td> <td>X</td> <td>January 2015</td> <td>Comprehensive analysis, final data, territorial differences</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Title of publication	Internet	Date	Content	Agriculture in Hungary, 2013, preliminary data	X	January 2014	Number of holdings, land use and sown area, type of farm, purpose of production, livestock, farm labour force, agricultural buildings and machineries and equipments. NUTS 2 level.	Agriculture in Hungary, 2013 final data	X	July 2014	Number of holdings, Standard Output value, land use, agricultural production methods, livestock, farm labour force, agricultural buildings and machineries, non agricultural activities in the holding. NUTS 3 level.	Agricultural buildings and machineries by age groups	X	September 2014	Agricultural buildings and machineries by age groups and legal form	Agriculture in Hungary, FSS 2013	X	January 2015	Comprehensive analysis, final data, territorial differences
Title of publication	Internet	Date	Content																	
Agriculture in Hungary, 2013, preliminary data	X	January 2014	Number of holdings, land use and sown area, type of farm, purpose of production, livestock, farm labour force, agricultural buildings and machineries and equipments. NUTS 2 level.																	
Agriculture in Hungary, 2013 final data	X	July 2014	Number of holdings, Standard Output value, land use, agricultural production methods, livestock, farm labour force, agricultural buildings and machineries, non agricultural activities in the holding. NUTS 3 level.																	
Agricultural buildings and machineries by age groups	X	September 2014	Agricultural buildings and machineries by age groups and legal form																	
Agriculture in Hungary, FSS 2013	X	January 2015	Comprehensive analysis, final data, territorial differences																	
<b>7.2.b Date of issuing (actual or planned)</b>																				
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Title of publication</th> <th>Publication date (actual, planned)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Agriculture in Hungary, 2013, preliminary data</td> <td>16 January 2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agriculture in Hungary, 2013 final data</td> <td>8 July 2014</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Title of publication	Publication date (actual, planned)	Agriculture in Hungary, 2013, preliminary data	16 January 2014	Agriculture in Hungary, 2013 final data	8 July 2014														
Title of publication	Publication date (actual, planned)																			
Agriculture in Hungary, 2013, preliminary data	16 January 2014																			
Agriculture in Hungary, 2013 final data	8 July 2014																			

Agricultural buildings and machineries by age groups 1 September 2014  
 Agriculture in Hungary, FSS 2013 30 January 2015

### 7.2.c References for on-line publications.

[http://www.ksh.hu/agricultural\\_census?lang=en](http://www.ksh.hu/agricultural_census?lang=en)

### 7.3. Dissemination format - online database

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

Will be available by the end of January 2015

#### 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.*

	2014	2015
1-st quarter	1250	1074
2-nd quarter	1349	1026
3-rd quarter	1162	-
4-th quarter	1264	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>5025</b>	<b>-</b>

### 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.*

[http://www.ksh.hu/apps/meta.objektum?p\\_lang=EN&p\\_menu\\_id=430&p\\_almenu\\_id=101&p\\_ot\\_id=100&p\\_level=1&p\\_session\\_id=21051598&p\\_obj\\_id=OMC](http://www.ksh.hu/apps/meta.objektum?p_lang=EN&p_menu_id=430&p_almenu_id=101&p_ot_id=100&p_level=1&p_session_id=21051598&p_obj_id=OMC)

#### 7.5.b Main scientific references

*Please provide references.*

NA

#### 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.*

NA

### 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 definition of agricultural holding in HU covers also holdings with only forest, fish ponds, reeds, fur animals other than rabbits. A physical threshold is applied (see 2.b).

#### 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.

- There were no differences between the population covered in the national survey and the population by the records sent to Eurostat.
- In total 130 626 (20 common land units excluded) agricultural holding was covered according to the Hungarian farm definition which are included in 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.

- Handbook on implementing the FSS and SAPM definitions - REV 10 was used for the organisation of the current FSS survey.
- The number of hours/year for a full-time employee to calculate AWU: 8 hours/day; 225 days/year; 1800 hours/year.

### 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.

Data on common land exclusively used by a holding was not defined as common land. However data on common land was collected on a questionnaire (ANNEX\_IV) from the following organisations:

- Local municipality governments;
- National Land Fund Management Organisation (NFA);
- Parishes.

The question asked: Area of common land: ha, m<sup>2</sup>

Data on local municipality governments were collected by internet while data of other organisations were collected by mail or e-mail.

Data on common land area relates to permanent grassland and meadow.

Common land in terms of tenure classification is shared farming.

Common land area is recorded in a special unit in the dataset for each NUTS3 region (altogether 20 units), and is considered as an agricultural holding.

#### 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.

Some organisations did not send back the questionnaire.

#### 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.

The total area of common land relates to permanent grassland and meadow - rough grazing. In Hungary this kind of land use counts 67 228 hectares.

#### 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.

No information is available on the number of agricultural holdings making use of common land, about how many agricultural holdings use permanent grassland and meadow – rough grazing, forestry and/or unutilised agricultural area not exclusively.

20 common land holdings were created (one for each NUTS 3 unit). These holdings aggregate all of the areas considering grassland and meadow - rough grazing, forestry and unutilised agricultural area in Hungary county by county, which are used not exclusively by one holding only.

#### 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.

Data regarding the location of the holding is based on the so called EOVS (Uniform National Projection System) which is maintained by the Institute of Geodesy Cartography and Remote Sensing (IGCRS) in Hungary.

The EOVS coordinates of the statistical unit are created on the basis of the following questions included into the FSS 2013 questionnaire concerning the most important part of the holding:

- topographical lot number or,
- IACS block identifier of the place where the main agricultural production is carried out, or
- address of the holding.

##### 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).

The transformation of EOVS coordinates into ETRS 89 coordinates is ensured by Arc GIS software.

##### 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).

Longitude and latitude coordinates were rounded to the nearest 3 digit.

##### 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).

Basis of identification		Number of holdings	%
Location of the most important means of production	Topographical lot number	Identification code of a parcel according to the Land Register	22 326 17,1
	IACS block identifier	Identification code of a parcel in the IACS system	29 904 22,9
Address of the holding		Residence of the farmer	78 396 60
Administrative centre of NUTS3 region			20 0

Total	130 646	100
<b>8.1.f (new) Organic farming</b>		
<b>Possible differences between national standards and rules for certification of organic products and the ones set out in Council Regulation No.834/2007</b>		
<i>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).</i>		
There are no differences between the register definitions and Eurofarm definitions.		
[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		
<b>8.1.1. Asymmetry for mirror flow statistics - coefficient</b>		
[Not requested]		
<b>8.2. Comparability - over time</b>		
<b>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</b>		
<i>Please indicate the relevant case from the ones below:</i>		
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.		
<i>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.</i>		
a) There have been no changes, in which case it should be reported.		
<b>8.2.b (new) Possible changes in the coverage of holdings for which records are sent to Eurostat, the reasons and the impact on the comparability with previous sample survey/census data processed by Eurostat</b>		
<i>Please indicate the relevant case from the ones below:</i>		
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.		
<i>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.</i>		
a) There have been no changes.		
<b>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</b>		
<i>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:</i>		
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.		
<i>Particularly in the second case, please indicate any information relevant for users.</i>		
There have been no change, in which case it should be reported.		
<b>8.2.d (new) Changes over time in the results as compared to previous sample survey/census, which may be attributed to sampling variability</b>		
<i>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.</i>		
The sample is not representative for organic characteristics.		
<b>8.2.e Common Land</b>		
<b>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.</b>		
<i>Please specify possible changes and reasons.</i>		
No changes in the decision and in the methodology.		
<b>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)</b>		

Please specify.

### Comments on major trends from FSS 2010 to FSS 2013\*

	FSS 2010	FSS 2013	2013/2010	Difference,%
Common land area, ha	73 975	67 228	91%	-9,12

\*The figures used in the table as common land refers to only permanent grassland and meadow - rough grazing.

### 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.

### Comments on major trends from FSS 2010 to FSS 2013\*

	FSS 2010	FSS 2013	2013/2010	Comments	Difference in %
Number of holding	576 788	491 315	85%	Decreased due to concentration of holdings	-14,82
UAA (A_3_1), ha;	4 612 361	4 589 440	100%		-0,50
Arable land, ha	3 796 922	3 800 786	100%		0,10
Permanent grassland (B_3), ha;	646 923	635 489	98%		-1,77
Permanent crops (B_4), ha;	151 723	138 793	91%		-8,52
Wooded area (B_5_2), ha;	1 522 437	1 501 735	99%		-1,36
Unutilised Agricultural area (B_5_1), ha;	84 839	137 216	162%	Data entry application did not check the existence of this characteristic in 2010. Many of the data providers missed to fill in this field and these were not imputed later. The data entry application was improved in 2013. Thus the value of the two periods is not comparable	61,74
Fallow land (B_1_12_1 + B_1_12_2), ha;	260 041	131 609	51%	Due to flood in 2010 fallow land was not sown, but in 2013 due to favourable weather condition fallow land was used	-49,39
LS in LSU	2 483 785	2 259 078	91%		-9,05
Cattle (C_2), head;	707 396	755 087	107%		6,74
Family Labour force - persons	1 062 291	962 774	91%		-9,37
Family Labour force - AWU	325 052	314 715	97%		-3,18
Non family labour force - persons	99 819	106 148	106%		6,34
Non family labour force - AWU	84 397	91 875	109%		8,86

\* Common land area is not included in this comparison table

### 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

Data were compared at micro level with data of IACS and Uniform Animal Registration and Identification System. The differences were found acceptable.

#### 8.3.b Comparisons at macro level

- Data were compared with the results of the AC 2000, FSS 2003, 2005, 2007, AC 2010 and other statistical surveys such as crop and livestock surveys, institutional labour survey of enterprises and budgetary institutions. The results met the expectations.
- The FSS 2013 results have proved to be of good quality, however, the aggregates of different land areas cover only the area



that can be connected to the agricultural holdings. (At the same time the current statistics covers the land area unidentifiable with holdings as well, which means that the published aggregates contain and reflect additional expert estimations.)

## 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 data of agricultural organisations can be combined with other data or statistical domains.

- Agricultural enterprises: by register code
- Private holdings: by IACS register number, by land register plot number, by name and address.

#### 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.*

The regular survey on land area and sown area (May) as well as survey on livestock (June) were not carried out in 2013 separately, questions related to those surveys were incorporated into the FSS 2013 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 protection of personal data and the publicity of data of public interest are regulated by the following Acts in Hungary:

- Act XLVI of 1993 on Statistics;
- Act CXII of 2011 on Informational Self-Determination and on Freedom of Information.

Besides the above mentioned legal acts, internal regulations on confidentiality exist within the HCSO. The access to statistical data is regulated in a separate internal regulation (Regulation 18/2014. on the rules of data access) which contains the rules on the six data access channels of the HCSO.

As regards to access to microdata for scientific purposes, researchers may have access to data through six channels upon filling in the request form published on the HCSO's website. The six data access channels are: release of tabular data, public use files, release of anonymised microdata sets, Safe Centre, remote access and remote execution. The first 2 channels are open to all users; the latter four channels are available exclusively for scientific purposes.

Anonymised microdata may be accessed by research institutions within the framework of a contract with the HCSO. Anonymised microdata are microdata which have been modified in order to reduce to an acceptable level, in accordance with current best practice, the disclosure risk of statistical units to which they relate.

The researcher may only use the data file for the scientific research purpose indicated in the request form and the data file has to be destroyed upon fulfilment of that purpose. The detailed conditions for the use of anonymised microdata are regulated in the contract

between the research institution and the HCSO.

Researchers may also have access to microdata in a secure environment such as the HCSO's Safe Centre, other remote access points and through remote execution. Concerning the Farm Structure Surveys data of 2000, 2005, 2007, 2010 are already accessible and that of 2013 is planned to be made accessible for researchers.

The HCSO facility in Szeged is providing a remote access service to researchers under the same conditions as for the Safe Centre environment (available on HCSO premises in Budapest). The remote access system is currently a pilot system, still under development.

In the form of remote execution, researchers can also apply for research outputs based on microdata sets. Using this access channel, the researchers are requested to send detailed specifications and descriptions, syntax, etc. to HCSO and the data is prepared by HCSO experts within HCSO. Outputs produced are released following an obligatory output checking procedure (common procedure for Safe Centre, remote access and remote execution).

Data made available in the Safe Centre, remote access and remote execution does not contain direct identifiers. The access environment is strictly monitored and the research outputs are checked for statistical disclosure before they may be taken from the safe environment by the researcher.

The process of the evaluation of the data request for the safe environment data access channels covers checking information both on the research purpose and the researchers. Access is granted based on a contract which stipulates the conditions of access.

## 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 access of anonymised microdata is possible according to the above mentioned rules. Anonymisation criteria for FSS used in Hungary are the following:

In general, all data disseminated by HCSO goes through obligatory statistical disclosure control (SDC) procedures. Under the legal conditions, if the number of statistical units contributing to a value is less than 3, then the concerned value is protected by SDC methods. The common SDC method used for protecting this information is cell suppression. Under the HCSO internal data protection regulation, all datasets are checked for secondary cell suppression where primary cell suppression is applied. Direct identifiers are removed from all datasets (except in cases regulated by law).

All research outputs produced in the safe environment (Safe Centre, remote access, remote execution) also go through obligatory output checking procedures.

Apart from these obligatory provisions, the typical SDC methods applied to FSS data are the following:

- global recoding (removing a dimension (e.g. column)),
- sub-sampling based on microdata,
- local suppression.

## 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*

**Steps**

**Starting time**

**Ending time**

1.



<b>12.b The bodies involved and the split of responsibilities among bodies</b> with respect to the main steps of the survey process	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>1.4. Promotion</td> <td>HCSO Regional Departments (RD), RAESD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Survey design</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.1. Set up organisation of the survey</td> <td>RAESD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.2. Definition of the survey variables</td> <td>RAESD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.3. Design of the sampling frame and sampling procedures</td> <td>RAESD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.4. Design of data collection procedures</td> <td>RAESD, RD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.5. Design of data processing procedures</td> <td>RAESD, RD, IT Department</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.6. Design of survey organisation and execution</td> <td>RAESD, RD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.7. Pilot survey organisation and execution</td> <td>RAESD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Data collection</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.1. Sampling frame construction and sample selection</td> <td>RAESD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.2. Recruitment of interviewers</td> <td>RD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.3. Training of interviewers</td> <td>RD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.4. Fieldwork</td> <td>RD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.5. Evaluation and assessment of fieldwork</td> <td>RD, RAESD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. Data processing and validation</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.1. Data entry and data coding</td> <td>RAESD, RD, IT Department</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.2. Data validation (at record level)</td> <td>RAESD, RD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.3. Data correction and imputation</td> <td>RAESD, RD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5. Data compilation</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>5.1. Weight calculation and estimation</td> <td>RAESD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5.2. Calculation of derived variables</td> <td>RAESD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5.3. Calculation of quality indicators</td> <td>RAESD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5.4. Aggregation and tabulation</td> <td>RAESD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5.5. Validation and aggregated data</td> <td>RAESD, RD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6. Data analysis</td> <td>RAESD, Dissemination Department</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7. Data dissemination</td> <td>RAESD, Dissemination Department</td> </tr> </table>	1.4. Promotion	HCSO Regional Departments (RD), RAESD	2. Survey design		2.1. Set up organisation of the survey	RAESD	2.2. Definition of the survey variables	RAESD	2.3. Design of the sampling frame and sampling procedures	RAESD	2.4. Design of data collection procedures	RAESD, RD	2.5. Design of data processing procedures	RAESD, RD, IT Department	2.6. Design of survey organisation and execution	RAESD, RD	2.7. Pilot survey organisation and execution	RAESD	3. Data collection		3.1. Sampling frame construction and sample selection	RAESD	3.2. Recruitment of interviewers	RD	3.3. Training of interviewers	RD	3.4. Fieldwork	RD	3.5. Evaluation and assessment of fieldwork	RD, RAESD	4. Data processing and validation		4.1. Data entry and data coding	RAESD, RD, IT Department	4.2. Data validation (at record level)	RAESD, RD	4.3. Data correction and imputation	RAESD, RD	5. Data compilation		5.1. Weight calculation and estimation	RAESD	5.2. Calculation of derived variables	RAESD	5.3. Calculation of quality indicators	RAESD	5.4. Aggregation and tabulation	RAESD	5.5. Validation and aggregated data	RAESD, RD	6. Data analysis	RAESD, Dissemination Department	7. Data dissemination	RAESD, Dissemination Department
1.4. Promotion	HCSO Regional Departments (RD), RAESD																																																						
2. Survey design																																																							
2.1. Set up organisation of the survey	RAESD																																																						
2.2. Definition of the survey variables	RAESD																																																						
2.3. Design of the sampling frame and sampling procedures	RAESD																																																						
2.4. Design of data collection procedures	RAESD, RD																																																						
2.5. Design of data processing procedures	RAESD, RD, IT Department																																																						
2.6. Design of survey organisation and execution	RAESD, RD																																																						
2.7. Pilot survey organisation and execution	RAESD																																																						
3. Data collection																																																							
3.1. Sampling frame construction and sample selection	RAESD																																																						
3.2. Recruitment of interviewers	RD																																																						
3.3. Training of interviewers	RD																																																						
3.4. Fieldwork	RD																																																						
3.5. Evaluation and assessment of fieldwork	RD, RAESD																																																						
4. Data processing and validation																																																							
4.1. Data entry and data coding	RAESD, RD, IT Department																																																						
4.2. Data validation (at record level)	RAESD, RD																																																						
4.3. Data correction and imputation	RAESD, RD																																																						
5. Data compilation																																																							
5.1. Weight calculation and estimation	RAESD																																																						
5.2. Calculation of derived variables	RAESD																																																						
5.3. Calculation of quality indicators	RAESD																																																						
5.4. Aggregation and tabulation	RAESD																																																						
5.5. Validation and aggregated data	RAESD, RD																																																						
6. Data analysis	RAESD, Dissemination Department																																																						
7. Data dissemination	RAESD, Dissemination Department																																																						
<b>12.c Serious deviations (if any) from the established calendar and reasons.</b> <i>Please mention only serious deviations with significant consequences on the quality and the transmission time of data to Eurostat.</i>	No serious deviation from the established calendar.																																																						
<b>12.1. Source data</b>																																																							
<b>12.1.a Target population</b>																																																							
<b>12.1.a.1 The national definition of an agricultural holding</b>																																																							
<i>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.</i>																																																							
<p>The target population has two main groups in Hungary: private holdings and agricultural enterprises.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Private holdings:</b> definition of farm, see below.</li> <li>• <b>Agricultural enterprises:</b> legal entities engaged in any kind of agricultural activity regardless of its size. Agricultural enterprises operating in 2013 formed the frame according to the Business Register of HCSO. Additional agricultural enterprises were added based on administrative records. As a company starts its operation, a compulsory registration form should be fulfilled and sent to the HCSO. The legal representative indicates whether there is any land area for agricultural purposes related to the organisation's activity. Based on this obligation, the HCSO has a full scope register on Hungarian agricultural enterprises.</li> </ul>																																																							
<b>Private holdings</b>																																																							

Households engaged in agricultural activity reaching or exceeding certain physical threshold at the reference time of the survey.

According to the physical threshold of the FSS 2013 a private holding on 1<sup>st</sup> June 2013 uses at least

Value	Denomination	Code
≥ 1500 m <sup>2</sup>	productive land area (including jointly or separately arable land (including nurseries and other permanent crops), kitchen garden, orchard, vineyard, meadow, pasture, forest, fish-pond, reed), and/or	A_3_1+B_5_2+fish-pond+reed
≥ 500 m <sup>2</sup>	orchards or vineyards, jointly or separately (at least 400 m <sup>2</sup> of fruit trees and 200 m <sup>2</sup> of berries or vines), and/or	B_4_1+B_4_4
≥ 100 m <sup>2</sup>	land area under cover, and/or	B_1_7_2+B_1_8_2
≥ 50 m <sup>2</sup>	mushroom area, and/or	B_6_1
≥ 1 head	bigger animals, such as cattle, buffalo, pig, horse, sheep, goat, emu, ostrich, donkey, and/or	C_1+C_2+C_3_1+C_3_2+C_4+C_5_3_4+donkey
≥ 50 head	heads of poultry, jointly or separately, such as hens, geese, ducks, turkeys, guinea fowls, and/or	C_5
≥ 25 head	rabbits (not just breeding females), furry animals, pigeons for slaughter, and/or	C_6+furry animals+pigeons for slaughter
≥ 5 hive	bee hives and/or	C_7
	agricultural services provided during the previous 12 months	not directly linked to EUF characteristic

The same as in 2010.

**Of which: Key private holdings** (reaching or exceeding certain physical threshold)

Value	Denomination	Code
≥ 250 ha	arable land, and/or	B_1_1+...+B_1_11+B_1_12_1+B_1_12_2
≥ 17 ha	vineyard, and/or	B_4_4
≥ 20 ha	ha orchard, and/or	B_4_1
≥ 100 ha	forest, and/or	B_5_2
≥ 150 ha	grassland, and/or	B_3
≥ 150 head	cattle, and/or	C_2
≥ 300 head	pigs, and/or	C_4
≥ 25 head	horses, and/or	C_1
≥ 500 head	sheep, and/or	C_3_1
≥ 40 head	goats, and/or	C_3_2
≥ 20 000 head	chickens, and/or	not directly linked to EUF characteristic
≥ 5 000 head	geese, and/or	C_5_3_3
≥ 10 000 head	ducks, and/or	C_5_3_2
≥ 5 000 head	turkeys, and/or	C_5_3_1
≥ 120 head	guinea fowls, and/or	not directly linked to EUF characteristic
≥ 300 head	rabbits, and/or	not directly linked to EUF characteristic
≥ 200 head	pigeons, and/or	not directly linked to EUF characteristic
≥ 300 hive	bee hives and/or	C_7
≥ 200 head	other furry animals, and/or	not directly linked to EUF characteristic
≥ 50 head	ostrich, and/or	C_5_3_4
≥ 10 head	emu, and/or	not directly linked to EUF characteristic

#### **Agricultural enterprises**

Legal entities engaged in any kind of agricultural activity regardless of its size. Agricultural enterprises operated in 2013 formed the frame of the survey based on the Business Register of HCSO. Additional agricultural enterprises were added based on administrative records.

**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.*

The holdings above the thresholds (see 12.1.a.1) forming the entire universe of the agricultural holdings in Hungary. The households engaged in agricultural activities but under the thresholds are not considered as agricultural holdings.



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

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

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

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

See 12.1.a.1

**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).*

- **Agricultural enterprises:** 12 915 agricultural enterprises were selected of which 8 798 carried out agricultural activity.
- **Private holdings:** 3 246 enumeration district were selected from the enumeration districts of the AC 2010 (total 13 897). The selected enumeration areas contained cc. 580 000 addresses. After applying the farm threshold 119 294 questionnaires were completed by enumerators while 2 534 were sent via internet before the surveyors started their work on the field.
- **Total number of holdings:** 130 626 (20 common land units excluded).

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

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

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

The coverage of the records sent to Eurostat is equal with the national survey coverage.

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

Number of holdings: 130 626 (20 common land units excluded)

**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.*

Number of holdings with standard output equal to zero: 6052

- 38 holdings with 'other livestock' - rabbits except breeding rabbits;
- 2520 holdings with only fallow land kept in good agricultural and environmental conditions;
- 1350 holdings with area of kitchen garden and that of forest, fish-pond and reeds (see 12.1.a.1);
- 2144 holdings with area of forest, fish-pond and reeds (see 12.1.a.1).

**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.*

Not relevant. Due to the correspondence between the thresholds of the regulation and the Hungarian criteria, there is no chance to fail to meet the requirements.

**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.*

1. **Agricultural enterprises:** full scope survey
2. **Small private holdings:** sample survey
3. **Key private holdings:** full scope survey



#### 4. Administrative sources:

- Organic farming
- IACS
- Vineyard register

#### 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.*

- **Agricultural enterprises:** Business Register of HCSO containing legal entities engaged in any kind of agricultural activity regardless of its size. Agricultural enterprises operation in 2013 formed the frame. Additional enterprises were added based on administrative records.
- **Private holdings:** enumeration areas of AC 2010, Farm 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.*

- **Agricultural enterprises:** list frame.
- **Small private holdings:** combination of area and list frame.
- **Key private holdings:** list frame
- **Urban areas:** list frame

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

- **Business register:** updated continuously with data transmitted from the Registry Court.
- **Farm register:** the farm register of private holdings can be updated exhaustively when an agricultural census is carried out. Between the agricultural census 2000 and 2010 the farm register was updated only partially based on the information of the Census of Vineyards and Fruit Plantations 2001 (CVFP 2001), FSSs (2003, 2005, 2007, 2013) and regular annual sample surveys. In the preparation phase of FSS 2013 the register was completed with information from the following administrative sources:
  - data of farmers receiving area based subsidies (from IACS);
  - farmers involved in organic farming (from Organic Farming Register).

#### 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.*

Private holdings (apart from key private holdings) – One-stage cluster sampling.  
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.*

**Stratified one-stage cluster sampling was applied**, where the stratification means geographical stratification (counties) and the clusters are districts. Districts were selected and within each district all the farms are included (including new farms as well). The selection rate of districts was different county by county. Each projection factors were calculated at county level.

##### 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.*

## Enumeration districts

**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.*

Agricultural enterprises – full scope, no stratification variable

Key private holdings – full scope, no stratification variable

(Small) private holdings – county (NUTS3)

**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.*

(Small) private holdings – simple random sampling to select districts

**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).*

(Small) private holdings – no full coverage strata

Agricultural enterprises and Key private holdings – full scope

**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.*

Private holdings – 3 246 enumeration areas, equal allocation

**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.*

New sample is drawn for each occasion

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

Oracle/SQL/Excel

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

No

**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.*

**1. Name: Organic Farming Register**

- **Legal base:** Council Regulation (EC) 473/2002; Ministerial Regulation (MARD) No 140/99; Ministerial Regulation (MARD-EM) No 2/2000
- **Time reference:** 2013
- **Updating of the source:** continuously

**2. Name: Integrated Administrative and Control System (IACS)**

- **Legal base:** Council Regulation (EEC) 1782/2003
- **Time reference:** 2013
- **Updating of the source:** continuously

**3. Name: Vineyard Register**

- **Legal base:** Council Regulation (EEC) 479/2008; Council Regulation (EEC) 436/2009
- **Time reference:** 2013
- **Updating of the source:** continuously

**4. Uniform Animal Registration and Identification System**

- **Legal base:** Ministerial Regulation (MARD) No 99/2002. (15. XI.)
- **Time reference:** 2013
- **Updating of the source:** continuously

**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.*

- 1. Organic Farming Register** – agricultural holding
- 2. Integrated Administrative and Control System (IACS)** – agricultural holding
- 3. Vineyard Register** – agricultural holding
- 4. Uniform Animal Registration and Identification System** – agricultural holding

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

<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Administrative source</b> <i>Please specify the name of the administrative source(s) in the rows of this column. The row(s) where the name(s) of the source(s) is (are) specified indicate(s) the purpose(s) of the use of that (those) source(s).</i>
- to totally replace the survey, on all characteristics and on the whole survey population	
- 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organic Farming Register</li> <li>• Administrative and Control System (IACS)</li> <li>• Vineyard Register - Quality wine area</li> </ul> <p>in the FSS land area data are collected only vineyards according to the main use (for wine, table, other). In order to split the quality wine grapes the following method was used:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the land area of quality and other wines by wine communities have been received from the National Council of Wine Communities (NCWC), from which a ratio among them was calculated on the lowest available level,</li> <li>2. the list of municipalities for each wine community is available,</li> <li>3. the holdings cultivating vineyards were linked to the regarding wine community using the names (codes) of the settlements</li> <li>4. the vineyard area of each farmer in the regarding wine community was split among the quality and other wine categories according to the calculated ratio,</li> <li>5. the vineyards outside the wine communities are considered as other wines, because legally quality wines are not to be produced on areas outside the wine communities.</li> </ol>
- to replace the survey on all characteristics and on a part of the survey population	
- to replace the survey on some of the characteristics and on a part of the survey population. <i>Please indicate these (groups of) characteristics, the common identifiers and the method(s) of integration (record linkage algorithm).</i>	
- to build/update the (sampling) frame (used for census or for sample survey)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organic Farming Register</li> <li>• Integrated Administrative and Control System (IACS)</li> </ul>
- to pre-fill answers in the questionnaires which are then checked by farmers during the survey	
- to impute item/unit non-response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IACS</li> </ul>
- to validate the survey data (quality control). <i>Please indicate</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uniform Animal Registration and Identification System</li> </ul>

<i>actions taken in case of large discrepancies</i>	on bovine
- to calibrate of survey estimates. <i>Please indicate the calibration variables</i>	
- other ( <i>please specify in the next column</i> )	

#### 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.

#### 1. Name: Organic Farming Register

The organic farming register mainly maintained by Biokontroll Hungária Nonprofit KFT. covers the majority of the organic farms in Hungary (about 95% of the certified production). Data on the remaining data of organic farms (5%) are maintained by the Hungária ÖKO Garancia KFT.

The link between the organic farm register and the holdings surveyed is created by the following way:

- Matching statistical ID Code in case of the agricultural enterprises;
- Matching IACS block identifiers. Some respondent did not provide this data in FSS 2013 questionnaire;
- Matching organic producer ID code. Some respondent did not provide this data in FSS 2013 questionnaire;
- Matching name and address in case of the private holdings where IACS block identifiers were not available. In this case some manual work was needed;
- The reference period of the organic farming register is different from the reference period of the farm structure survey, because the control and registration of organic farming is taken place in the period from spring till autumn of the year concerned.

#### 2. Name: Integrated Administrative and Control System (IACS)

- Matching statistical ID Code in case of the agricultural enterprises;
- Matching IACS block identifiers. Some respondent did not provide this data in FSS 2013 questionnaire;
- Matching name and address in case of the private holdings where IACS block identifiers were not available. In this case some manual work was needed;

#### 3. Name: Vineyard Register

- It is not possible to provide individual distribution on quality vine area only on Vine Community Level.

#### 4. Uniform Animal Registration and Identification System

- There were no difficulties.

#### 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.

	<b>Administrative source and assessment of errors</b> Please specify the name of the administrative source(s) in this column, along with information required for each row.
<b>-coverage:</b>	<b>For all administrative sources (1, 2, 3, 4)</b>

<p><b>- over-coverage</b> 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.</p>	no
<p><b>- under-coverage</b> If the source covers less units than it should, please provide an assessment of the extent of under-coverage (if possible) and mention if and how the missing information is derived.</p>	no undercoverage for the relevant characteristics
<p><b>- misclassification</b> Please mention whether the information allows for the requested classification of units and whether there are errors in classification variables.</p>	no
<p><b>- multiple listings</b> Please provide an assessment on units which were present more than once in the source and specify how the duplicates were eliminated.</p>	no
<p><b>- rate of unreported events</b> 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.</p>	unreported events are negligible
<p><b>- missing data</b> (analogue to item and unit non-response errors in a survey). Please provide an assessment of missing data, specify for which characteristics and how it was accounted for (e.g. by imputation).</p>	not applied
<p><b>- errors in register variables</b> (analogue to measurement errors in a survey) i.e. erroneous values for certain variables</p>	not relevant
<p><b>- processing errors.</b> Please provide an assessment. You can mention here imputation methods used, if any.</p>	not relevant
<p><b>- coherence</b> (comparison to other available data) of the administrative data (ex-ante and/or ex-post)</p>	not relevant
<p><b>- other drawbacks (if any)</b> of the use of data from the administrative source. Please specify the drawbacks in the next column.</p>	not relevant

[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.

According to the relevant EU regulation in 2000, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2010, 2013

## 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.

- **Agricultural enterprises:** internet
- **Small private holdings:** internet, face to face interview
- **Key private holdings:** self completed paper questionnaire returned by mail, internet, face-to face interview

### Agricultural enterprises

From 2013 agricultural enterprises report their agricultural activity electronically which is a legal requirement in Hungary.

### Private holdings

Internet: there was a period (15-26 May) 2013 when private holdings could fill the questionnaire electronically.

Face to face interview: those private holdings did not send the questionnaire back by internet were surveyed by enumerators.

The precise description of the survey district was given to the enumerators and their work was assisted by the Field-work check-list (FCL) in each district. The function of check-list was to control completeness, to update the farm register and to provide information for arranging the payments.

All addresses within each district were printed beforehand including all available and relevant information: the identification code of the known agricultural holdings based on the farm register and names of the persons received from any of the used administrative sources. The streets within the list was arranged in alphabetical order and by increasing house numbers in order to provide utmost support to the enumerators visiting all addresses house by house within the boundaries of the survey district.

The task of the enumerator was to move house by house and to check whether addresses were correct and the persons living there were engaged in agricultural activity or not. Any differences to the pre-printed information had to be indicated by using codes.

The enumerators met three types of respondents concerning agricultural production:

- agricultural holdings;
- households engaged in agricultural activity but under the threshold;
- respondents not engaged in any agricultural activity (for example households without any agricultural activity, churches, shops, schools or other institutes, empty plot etc.)

The house by house method made it possible that holdings were not printed on (FCL) could be discovered.

The enumerator had to register on the FCL one of the followings in case of each address:

Status code	Description
101	Agricultural activity is given up (e.g. because death of the holder)
107	Moved to unknown address
201	Agricultural activity not carried out
203	Agricultural activity suspended
204	Agricultural activity is below threshold
801	Refusal
803	Can not be reached
999	Filled in questionnaire

Questionnaire has to be completed only on private holdings (households reached the threshold on 1st June 2013).

The enumerators also recorded some data of households engaged in agricultural activity under the threshold, such as productive land area, the number of chicken, duck, geese, bee colonies and rabbits were noted on the Field-work check-list.

Questions had to be asked from an adult person (holder, spouse or family member of holder, manager) being able to give reliable answers. If the enumerator did not find anybody on the spot who could answer properly, he/she had to fix another date of his/her the visit. If the respondent was not at home, the enumerator left a note with the date of his next visit. After three unsuccessful visits he/she had to report the case to the supervisor, just like cases when the respondents refused to answer.

### 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.



## 1. Entering data by the holder on line via internet (ELEKTRA)

- legal requirement for enterprises
- voluntary for private holdings

Main features:

- application in ORACLE form;
- data stored in the Central Database;
- integrated with other systems;
- ensuring flow control; limited number of on line checks included.

## 2. Entering data of questionnaires by the staff of HCSO

A uniform Data Entry and Validation System is run by HCSO having the following main features:

- application in ORACLE form;
- data stored in the Central Database;
- integrated with other systems (e.g. Meta-Database. Survey Control System. ELEKTRA system);
- ensuring flow control.

All data entry applications were developed by the IT Department of HCSO according to the specifications elaborated by the RAESD. The staff of the RAESD, the staff of Regional Departments, County Sections and the IT Department tested the data entry applications. During the test period there was direct and continuous communication with the software developers, so the detected problems, mistakes could be corrected immediately and suggestions on modifications were built in the applications continuously.

The logical and arithmetical coherency within and between the tables was incorporated in the data entry program. Besides entering the data, the application could produce different check lists: number of entered questionnaires per counties per days, number of questionnaires entered with an error, list of errors, aggregated data per tables per counties, statistics about the staff keying the data. These lists helped to monitor the whole process of data entry carried out by the staff of the regional directorates and county representatives as well as the central staff of HCSO.

Data were entered into Oracle database designed similarly as the tables of the questionnaires. The major part of the private holdings were entered by regional staff while estimations, data processing and data for the publication tables were produced by the staff of RAESD.

Before data entry of the questionnaires the information of the FCLs had to be entered. The register codes of the holdings controlled the data entry of the questionnaires. In case of a new holding a new register code was defined first, and only after it – practically the following day – the entry of the questionnaire was possible.

### 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.

#### Private holdings

- The surveyors and supervisors were trained how to handle difficult respondents. The survey supervisors with the help of the local authorities managed to convince nearly all the non-respondents, thus legal steps were not taken.
- In case of holders could not be contacted, the enumerator left a note to inform the holder about the time of his/her next visit.

#### Agricultural enterprises

- Automatic reminders were sent via email to the enterprises (t-5 days, t+1 day, t+4 day) did not sent the questionnaire back by due time.
- In ambiguous cases the missing data were fixed by the colleagues of the Regional Departments, by contacting the enterprises concerned.
- Legal steps were not taken.

### 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><b>Number of holdings in the population covered by the records sent to Eurostat</b> Please note that the survey coverage of the records sent to Eurostat can be different from the national survey coverage in case very low (or no) national thresholds are applied. In case of a census <math>1=3+4+5</math></p>	cc. 580 000
2.	<p><b>Number of holdings in the gross sample</b> The number of holdings selected from the sampling frame to be included in the sample. This item should be completed <u>only</u> in case of a sample survey, in which case <math>2=3+4+5</math></p>	182 110
3.	<p><b>(new) Number of ineligible holdings</b> The number of surveyed holdings which result to be out-of-scope (the frame is not updated and the data collection reveals that some holdings e.g. fall below set thresholds during the reference period), which do not exist at the selected address, which have the activities ceased during the reference period etc.</p>	49 780
3.1	<p><b>Number of holdings with ceased activities</b> This item is a subset of 3. <math>3.1 \geq 3.1.1 + 3.1.2</math></p>	12 135
3.1.1	<p><b>Number of holdings which definitively ceased i.e. the land is abandoned.</b> This item should be completed only if information is available.</p>	7 185
3.1.2	<p><b>Number of holdings with ceased activities following the change of manager</b> This item should be completed only if information is available.</p>	not available
4	<p><b>(new) Number of holdings with unknown eligibility status</b> The number of surveyed holdings which could not be contacted (e.g. in a CATI survey) and for which it is not certain if they are eligible (e.g. in scope) or not.</p>	1 412
5	<p><b>(new) Number of eligible holdings</b> The number of surveyed holdings which are eligible <math>5=5.1+5.2</math></p>	130 918
5.1	<p><b>Number of non-responding holdings</b> The number of eligible holdings which: - were contacted but refused to take part in the survey; - were contacted but were unable to participate in the survey for various reasons;</p>	496

	- 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 ( <b>unit non-response</b> ). <b>5.1&gt;=5.1.1+5.1.2</b>	
<b>5.1.1</b>	<b>Number of non-responding holdings – re-weighted</b>	-
<b>5.1.2</b>	<b>Number of non-responding holdings – imputed</b>	224
<b>5.2</b>	<b>Number of responding holdings</b> This item includes holdings which provided completed questionnaires, either entirely or partially.	130 422

**12.3.e Questionnaire(s)**

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

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

**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.

**On-line checks**

- Data format checks (ha, m<sup>2</sup>; use of decimals),
- Data value checks (eg. number of working days can not exceed 365)
- Completeness checks (eg. registration of arrived questionnaire, causes of non-response),
- Completeness checks within the questionnaires (eg. all identification information and compulsory information),
- Logical and arithmetical coherency within and between the tables (eg. in case of livestock data buildings related to it should be filled),
- Routing (skip) checks (eg. in case of no land use skip to the next question),
- Questionnaire could be sent after all errors corrected.

**Batch-checks**

- 493 checks (arithmetical and logical) included.

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

Please mention tools used.

1. A uniform Data Entry and Validation System is run by HCSO: application in ORACLE form;
2. GÉSA: data collection organiser and monitoring system of the HCSO;
3. Logical and arithmetical coherency within and between the tables was incorporated into the on line internet program (ELEKTRA) and into the data entry program;
4. The application could produce different check lists (batch checks in ADÉL): e.g. list of errors, aggregated data per tables per counties etc.

**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.

**Electronic questionnaire**

1. Respondents: on line checks built-in within and between tables,
2. Regional, centre staff:
  - batch checks, comparison of data with previous surveys and with administrative data.
  - email or phone to clarify data.

**Paper questionnaire**

FSS-team:

- Compiled the instructions for surveyors containing the unambiguous description of the agricultural concepts.
- A quality assurance system was developed whose main element was the list of the most important validation rules to be applied by supervisors during the assessment of the questionnaires.

Interviewer:

- During the implementation a multilevel quality assurance system was applied in which the upper levels controlled the levels below.
- Enumerators were familiar with the survey districts they worked, their training contributed to the high quality of the data to a great extent.

Supervisor:

- If the questionnaires included any kind of unreliable or erroneous items, the survey supervisors had to give it back to the enumerator for correction

Area agent:

- Controlled the work of supervisors.

Regional staff:

- Controlled the work of enumerators and supervisors in a part of a county. During the survey period they met and consulted several times.

**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.*

Inverse of the units' selection probabilities for farms which are part of sample frame

Inverse of the areas' selection probabilities for farms which are discovered in FSS

(Both selection probabilities are in county level)

**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.*

Not applied

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

*Please mention if you adjusted the weights to external sources and if so please describe and mention the variables used from the sources and the sources. Generally, samples are adjusted to external data sources in order to make their accuracy better.*

*For instance, the calibration technique aims at calculating new weights which provide error-free estimates for a certain number of characteristics. If the characteristics are strongly correlated with the variables of interest, then the level of accuracy for most of the survey estimates is improved.*

No

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

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

No

**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)**

**Annexes:**

[Formula 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.*

No

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

*Please suggest possible improvements.*

Use of internet data collection more widely.

**13.c Other annexes**

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

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

**Related metadata**

[Top](#)

**Annexes**

[Top](#)

[Questionnaire of private holdings](#)

[Questionnaire of enterprises](#)

[Fieldwork checklist private holdings](#)

[Questionnaire common land](#)

[Abbreviations](#)