



# 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. National Institute of Statistics  
Romania

Time Dimension: 2013-A0

Data Provider: RO1

Data Flow: FSS\_ESQRS\_A

## 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>National Institute of Statistics Romania</p>
<b>1.2. Contact organisation unit</b>	<p><i>Please specify an addressable subdivision of an organisation.</i></p> <p>General Direction of Economic Statistics - Direction of Agricultural and Environmental Statistics</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>16 Libertatii Blvd., Bucharest 5, ROMANIA</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)*

According to the statistical acquis communautaire in the field of the agricultural holdings structure, Romania conducted two general agricultural censuses in 2002 and 2010 and three farm structure surveys in the years 2005, 2007 and 2013. The first general agricultural census 2002 (GAC 2002) was carried out over the period 2 December 2002 – 31 January 2003.

The GAC 2002 data were processed at national level, development region level, county level and locality level and they were transmitted to Eurostat to the required format for the Eurofarm database containing 4 484 893 agricultural holdings.

The farm structure surveys 2005 and 2007 (FSS 2005 and FSS 2007) were conducted in accordance with the EU requirements based on the Council Regulation (EEC) No 571/ 88 on the organisation of Community surveys on the structure of agricultural holdings with its subsequent amendments and the Commission Decision No 115/2000 regarding the surveys on the structure of agricultural holdings in 2005 and 2007 with its subsequent amendments.

The farm structure survey 2005 (FSS 2005) was a sample survey in keeping with the EU requirements and the national ones on the basis of a sample representative at national/development region/county level (NUTS 3) of approximately 8 % from the population registered in the Farm Register (FR) according the results of GAC 2002. Out the total of 4 484 893 agricultural holdings a sample of 361 169 holdings was drawn with a margin of error of less than 5 %.

FSS 2007 was a sample survey based on a sample representative at national/development region/county level (NUTS 3) of approximately 8 % from the FR-registered population, updated with the information of FSS 2005. Thus, out of the total 4 480 664 agricultural holdings a sample of 354 742 agricultural holdings was taken, with a margin of error of under 5 %. The survey sample consisted of 336 299 agricultural holdings without legal personality and 18 443 agricultural holdings with legal personality, the latter being exhaustively surveyed.

The data collection for the general agricultural census 2010 (GAC 2010) and the survey on agricultural production methods 2010 (SAPM 2010) took place during the period December 2010 – January 2011. The preparations started in 2008 by setting up the legal frame and they ended in 2012 with the data being transmitted over to Eurostat.

A single questionnaire was used for the data collection for GAC 2010 and SAPM 2010 including all the characteristics applicable to Romania mentioned in Regulation (EC) No 1166/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council on farm structure surveys and the survey on agricultural production methods.

The farm structure survey 2013 (FSS 2013) was a sample survey, based on a sample representative at national/macro-region/development region/county level (NUTS3) of approximately 8,9 % from the FR-registered population, updated based on the information of GAC 2010. Thus, out of the total 3 859 043 holdings, a sample of 345 421 holdings was drawn, with a margin of error of less than 5 %. The survey sample consisted of 313 315 agricultural holdings without legal personality and 32 106 agricultural holdings with legal personality, the latter being exhaustively surveyed.

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

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

The national legal framework for FSS 2013 consisted of the following:

- Law No. 226/ 2009 on the organisation and functioning of the Romanian official statistics with its subsequent amendments and additions;
- Government Decision No. 957/2005 on the organisation and operation of the National Institute of Statistics with its subsequent amendments and add-ons;
- Government Decision No. 654/2013 on the approval of the National Annual Statistical Programme 2013;
- Government Decision No. 876/2014 on the approval of the National Annual Statistical Programme 2014;
- Law of the National Archives No. 16/1996, with its subsequent amendments and add-ons.
- Order of NIS President No. 1164/2012 on the setting up of the FSS 2013 team, changed and completed by the President's Order No.

<p>- the reference of the national legal base of the FSS survey (Act, Government Decree, etc.)</p>	<p>493/2013.</p> <p>The first two judicial acts represent the general legal base for the conduct of statistical surveys in Romania, as well as the provisions relative to the National Institute of Statistics, the producer of the Romanian official statistics and the fundamental principles of official statistics.</p> <p>The national annual statistical programmes for 2013 and 2014 respectively were approved through the Government Decisions No. 654/2013 and No. 876/2014 including the FSS 2013 sheets with the related activities for the two concerned years.</p> <p>The FSS 2013 sheets contain information about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objective</li> <li>- survey type</li> <li>- coverage</li> <li>- number of observed units</li> <li>- main variables surveyed</li> <li>- data-providing units</li> <li>- collaborating institutions</li> <li>- responsibilities of the implied institutions</li> <li>- primary data collection manner</li> <li>- data collection support</li> <li>- moment/periods of reference</li> <li>- data registration/collection period</li> <li>- main indicators resulted</li> <li>- data processing profile</li> <li>- data dissemination ways</li> <li>- data dissemination deadlines</li> </ul> <p>The Law of national archives No. 16/1996, with its subsequent amendments and add-ons represented the legal base for establishing the keeping period for FSS 2013 questionnaires before their destruction.</p>
<p>- the scope and the coverage of the survey</p>	<p>The FSS 2013 coverage was made up of agricultural holdings irrespective of their size and contribution to the agricultural production in accordance with the provisions of Regulation No.1166 / 2008.</p>
<p>- the frequency and the reference period of the survey</p>	<p>In Romania, the farm structure surveys are conducted every 3 years in the form of sample surveys and a census survey every 10 years according to the acquis communautaire.</p> <p>The data collection for FSS 2013 took place in the period 10 January – 10 February 2014.</p> <p>The reference periods were as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Crop year 2013 (1 October 2012 - 30 September 2013) for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land use</li> <li>• Information on the irrigation</li> <li>• Organic farming – crop sector</li> <li>• Agricultural machines and equipment</li> <li>• People having worked in agriculture</li> <li>• Other gainful activities</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. The last 3 years (2011, 2012, 2013) for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rural development measures</li> </ul> </li> </ol>

	<p>The moment of reference was 31 December 2013 for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Livestock numbers</li> <li>• Organic farming – animal sector</li> </ul>
<p>- the responsibility for the survey</p>	<p>The National Institute of Statistics was responsible for the whole organisation and conduct of FSS 2013. The NIS internal Directions involved were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At central level: Direction of Agricultural and Environment Statistics, General Direction of IT and Statistical Infrastructure, Direction of Budget and Accountancy, Direction of Human Resources Management, Direction of European Affairs and International Co-operation</li> <li>• At territorial level: all 42 county statistical offices</li> </ul> <p>The main NIS assignments were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the Direction of Agricultural and Environment Statistics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• developing legal acts</li> <li>• design of the questionnaire, methodological guide and interviewer's handbook</li> <li>• monitoring the statistical tools printing and distribution</li> <li>• establishing the data processing requirements at territorial and central level</li> <li>• developing the control tables and data check and validation</li> <li>• IT application use</li> <li>• data integrity analysis</li> <li>• treatment of non-response</li> <li>• data grossing up</li> <li>• design and implementation of control tables</li> <li>• publication preparation and making</li> <li>• completing the Eurofarm file and its transmission to Eurostat.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>A specialised company took care of the statistical tools printing and distribution. The IT application was sub-contracted to a specialised IT firm.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the county statistical offices level the tasks were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• recruitment and training of the interviewers</li> <li>• monitoring of the interviewers' work throughout the survey</li> <li>• reception of questionnaires and analysis of questionnaires filling-in</li> <li>• inputting the questionnaire data</li> <li>• data validation</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>For the good conduct of the survey at territorial level survey co-ordinators were designated, one for each county. The survey co-ordinators were trained by the county staff, who in their turn trained the local interviewers.</p>
<p>- the administrative and financial provisions</p>	<p>The National Institute of Statistics had its own budget and it additionally received an aid of 2 million euro from the EU to</p>

	conduct the concerned survey.
- the obligations of the respondents with respect to the survey	According to Law No. 226/ 2009 on the organisation and functioning of the Romanian official statistics with its subsequent amendments and add-ons “the data providers are obliged to submit to the producers of official statistics free of charge reliable, updated and complete data to the required deadlines and based on the collection methods mentioned in the National Annual Statistical Programme and in agreement with the related methodological norms.”
- the identification, protection and obligations of survey enumerators	<p>The data collection for FSS 2013 was done by direct face-to-face interview with the holder or another adult member of the holding for the agricultural holdings without legal personality and by self-registration under the co-ordinator’s supervision for the agricultural holdings with legal personality.</p> <p>Thus, in the case of the agricultural holdings without legal personality the data registration was ensured by the interviewers, who benefitted from the Interviewer’s Handbook and the methodological guide where every questionnaire chapter and indicator were explained in detail.</p> <p>The data on the agricultural holdings without legal personality were collected with the help of some 3000 interviewers recruited from agricultural/economic/IT and other field experts with at least an average level of education. At county level, 42 co-ordinators were hired for a pre-established period (one co-ordinator for each county).</p> <p>The interviewers identified themselves with a card signed by NIS President proving his/her official identity for the position assigned.</p> <p>- In performing his/her duties connected to FSS 2013, the interviewers were given the protection guaranteed by the law to the people implied in the exertion of the state authority.</p> <p>The interviewers were given a fee set by a NIS President’s order.</p> <p>The interviewers assignments were the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- acceptance by signature of his recruitment as interviewer</li> <li>- participation in the training sessions organised by the county statistical offices</li> <li>- receiving against signature the interviewer’s folder (list of holdings to be interviewed, questionnaires, manuals, etc.) and checking the related contents</li> <li>- studying the instructions for filling-in the FSS 2013 questionnaires and observing their provisions</li> <li>- preserving the confidentiality of the data and information contained in the questionnaire (this obligation was included in the interviewer’s work contract)</li> <li>- mandatory carriage of the card over the whole data collection period to prove the interviewer’s official quality</li> <li>- interviewing the declarants</li> <li>- informing the co-ordinators on the data collection stage on a permanent basis</li> <li>- handing over the folders with the FSS 2013 statistical tools (filled-in questionnaires, unfilled/ biased/ damaged ones, interviewer’s handbook, methodological guide and personal card).</li> </ul>
- the right of access to administrative data	<p>The national legislation foresees the possibility of using the administrative sources, but these cannot be used, due to various reasons, mentioned below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- lack of an unique identifier between statistical Farm register and other administrative agricultural registers;</li> </ul>

	- different definitions and methodologies for the observation units; The administrative sources in Romania, which have be considered for their reliable data could be: IACS and Organic farming.
- confidentiality provisions	According to Law No. 226/ 2009 on the organisation and functioning of the Romanian official statistics with its subsequent amendments and add-ons, the individual data put in the FSS 2013 questionnaires are confidential and to be used only for statistical purposes. Keeping the data confidentiality by NIS permanent staff is mandatory according to Law No. 226/ 2009. The obligation to preserve the confidentiality by the temporarily-hired staff was written down in the personal work contract.

### 3. Quality management - assessment

[Top](#)

[Not requested]

### 4. Relevance

[Top](#)

#### 4.1. Relevance - User Needs

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

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

The list of characteristics included in FSS 2013 only for national purposes contained:

- accounting records of the work on the holding (Y/N)
- sparse fruit trees – numbers
- equipment used to produce renewable energy (installed power and production)

These characteristics were included in FSS 2013 in order to obtain information necessary to: improve estimations in agricultural statistics (sparse fruit trees), design the FADN sample or identify potential data sources for energy statistics (installed power and production achieved for wind energy, solar energy and hydropower).

##### 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.*

All the reference periods or moments of the survey were observed according to Regulation No.1166/2008.

As regards the national characteristics the reference period was the 2012-2013 crop year.

The reference periods were as follows:

1. Crop year 2013 (1 October 2012 - 30 September 2013) for:

- Land use
- Information on the irrigation
- Organic farming – crop sector
- Agricultural machines and equipment
- People having worked in agriculture
- Other gainful activities

2. The last 3 years (2011, 2012 and 2013) for:

- Rural development measures

The moment of reference was 31 December 2013 for:

- Livestock numbers
- Organic farming – animal sector

#### 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 list of characteristics surveyed through FSS 2013 included all the characteristics mentioned in Annex III to Regulation No.1166/2008, except for those non-existent in Romania. The list of non-existent characteristics was transmitted to Eurostat and is presented in the annex below.

The non-existent characteristics were marked in the Eurofarm file with the symbol “:”, pursuant to the indications in the Data supplier manual.

[\[1\]](#)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:

[NS and/or NE characteristics in Romania](#)

##### 4.3.1. Data completeness - rate

[Not requested]

## 5. Accuracy and reliability

[Top](#)

### 5.1. Accuracy - overall

#### Main sources of error

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

The main source of errors was analysed in the following items of this chapter. Other common sources of errors (e.g. measurement errors caused by respondents and interviewers) were minimized by appropriate methodological and organizational activities (described further).

### 5.2. Sampling error

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

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

*The precision requirements stipulated in Annex IV "Precision Requirements" of the Regulation 1166/2008 are applicable*

only in some cases, depending on the actual value of characteristics. Thus, we are first interested to know the actual value of characteristics, in order to determine the applicability of precision requirements.

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

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

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

The relative standard error (RSE) was calculated as describing in Annex 1.

### Annexes:

[Methods and formulas applied for Relative Standard Error](#)

#### 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.

There were no cases where the precision requirements are applicable and where RSE has a value of more than 5% at NUTS 2 level, except for the characteristic C\_3\_1 in the region RO41 where the difference is insignificant (5,12%).

### Annexes:

[5.2.1.a Relative standard errors](#)

[5.2.a Applicability of precision requirements](#)

#### 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.

In Romania the non-response rate is very low, which makes the non-response bias to be not significant.

#### 5.3.1. Coverage error

##### 5.3.1.a Under-coverage errors

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



The coverage errors (under coverage, over coverage limits, biased classifications, contact errors, etc) were very few and the existing ones were corrected by the interviewers together with the co-ordinators, the latter being helped by the county offices specialists. This operation took place during the preliminary visits and also along the data collection period.

#### **5.3.1.b Over-coverage**

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

There were recorded 13 209 units, which result to be out-of-scope, or having the activities ceased during the reference period, from various reasons: no longer meet the agricultural holding requirements, or the agriculture land was abandoned. All this units were excluded from the sample, after collecting the information on them, without treating them.

#### **5.3.1.c Misclassification errors**

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

There were not made changes of the distribution of holdings into strata, following the changes by units of the values of stratification variables.

#### **5.3.1.d Contact errors**

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

In the case of agricultural holdings with incomplete and incorrect contact data, the interviewers contacted the coordinators from Statistical County Offices. These have consulted the administrative records from the city halls, in order to recover these identification data. The agricultural holdings for which they could not recover this data there were listed in table 12.3.d, point 4, as "agricultural holdings with unknown eligibility status", with a total of 10 631 units.

#### **5.3.1.e Multiple listings**

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

There were no such cases.

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

Not applicable

#### **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).*

The over-coverage rate, obtained by dividing the ineligible sampled holdings to the gross sample, represents 3.50%.

#### **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.*

To avoid errors of measurement, the FSS 2013 questionnaire was developed by chapter (General information, Land use, livestock etc).

- The reference moment or period was specified on every chapter heading
- The questionnaire included the arithmetical checks between rows
- If the queries had to be ticked off, mention was made on the questionnaire if it was a single or multiple answering variant.

Throughout the interview, the interviewer had several obligations that contributed to the reduction of measurement errors.

- The obligation to decline his/her official quality as interviewer by showing the personal card when first visiting an agricultural holding without personality
- Interviewing a competent person from the agricultural holding without personality, preferably its holder or any other adult member in full working capacity
- Avoiding the interview in front of people that do not belong to the concerned holding by explaining the information is confidential and to be used only for statistical purposes
- Handing over an unfilled questionnaire to the interviewee in order for him/her to be able to follow the questions more easily.
- To get precise and sincere replies, the questions were formulated clearly and politely
- If the questions had several answering variants, the interviewee was presented a full list of them so he/she may choose the correct one
- The interviewee was never interrupted before finishing answering the *questionnaire* even if he/she hesitated (the hesitation may be due to the fact that the respondent tried to remember various aspects related to the information requested)
- Taking down the replies as they were provided by the interviewee.
- Coming back to certain questions where the answer did not meet the arithmetical checks or if they did not correlate. Due to the above measures, no major measurement errors were scored.
- Requesting the interviewee's signature on the completed basic questionnaire to certify data quality.

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

Not available.

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

Not available.

### 5.3.3. Non response error

#### 5.3.3.a (new) Unit non-response: reasons and treatment

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

The reasons for the non-response at unit level were: refused interview and other situations. In such cases, a re-weighting to adjust the grossing-up coefficients and also imputations were made for the eligible non-respondent units only.

#### 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.*

There were no characteristics with a high non-response rate.

Once the questionnaires were collected a first data pre-validation was performed.

The filled-in questionnaires were re-checked by the co-ordinators and by county offices staff. In case of missing data, the unit was contacted. If this procedure did not function, the data were adjusted or imputed.

There were several cases when adjustments or imputation methods were applied to certain variables. The most

frequent cases were detected for the holdings where the number of working days (in an 8-hour equivalent) exceeded the 245 day threshold or for the holdings where the questionnaire had missing information about the people having worked in the agriculture (gender, age etc.).

#### 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).*

According to the completeness code mentioned on the form, the non-response rate was of 0.50%.

#### 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.*

No major non-response was registered for the characteristics.

#### 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.*

The processing errors occurred at data input and this was due to the wrong typing of certain values. They were not quantitatively assessed as most of them were dealt with on the spot

##### 5.3.4.b Completion/corrections methods applied

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

Data correction was made as follows:

- on-the-spot, if errors were included in the logical checks;
- if not, they have been detected through the control and extreme value tables. In this case, the co-ordinator was contacted and the questionnaire was corrected.

##### 5.3.4.c Imputation methods

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

Imputations were made when detecting the certain missing information on the questionnaires, particularly relative to the people having worked in the agriculture (gender, age, etc.). If so, the information providing useful data was checked in the first place (family and Christian name, personal identification code, etc.). If even such information was missing then imputations were made to complete the missing data, taking into consideration the frequency in the answers on the questionnaires containing full information.

For each of the above-mentioned situations, the weight of the holdings submitted to imputation was smaller than 2% of the total number of surveyed holdings.

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

After entering the FSS 2013 data and after applying all checks and solving the questionnaire errors, they were analysed at local level by statisticians based on tables specially designed for every indicator both at national and county level to detect eventual inconsistencies.

According to the error type detected, the solving was made at local level through individual corrections and also at central level automatically.

After the errors were analysed by NIS methodological team, the IT firm who provided the data input and processing application was requested to make automatic corrections.

There were detected cases of holdings where the number of working days (in an 8 hour/per day equivalent) exceeded the threshold of 245 days/year, i.e. the maximum allowed in Romania. In such cases automatic corrections were applied by changing the number of days to maximum 245.

For every situation mentioned, the weight of the holdings undergoing correction methods was of less than 2% of the total number of surveyed holdings.

The data correction check was resumed every time a correction was needed in the database until all errors were solved.

#### 5.3.4.1. Imputation - rate

##### 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.*

The imputation method was especially used for the indicator number of days worked by the holder family members. The imputation rate was of less than 2 %.

#### 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.

Not applicable

#### 5.3.6. Data revision

N/A

##### 5.3.6.1. Data revision - policy

##### Brief description of the revision policy

As a rule, data in FSS are not subject to revisions.

##### 5.3.6.2. Data revision - practice

##### Data revision practice

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

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

No revision were done

##### 5.3.6.3. Data revision - average size

[Not requested]

#### 5.3.7. Seasonal adjustment

[Not requested]

## 6. Timeliness and punctuality

[Top](#)

### 6.1. Timeliness

The publication of the final results of FSS 2013 was done according to the General Programme for Organizing and Conducting the Farm Structure Survey 2013.

#### 6.1.1. Time lag - first result

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

11 and a half months

#### 6.1.2. Time lag - final result

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

12 months

### 6.2. Punctuality

See below

**6.2.1. Punctuality - delivery and publication**

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

The results of FSS 2013 were published in accordance with the General Programme of FSS 2013 organisation and conduct and the Annual National Statistical programme approved by Government Decision mentioned in detail in section 2.b.

The final results of FSS 2013 were sent to Eurostat according to the provisions of Regulation (EC) No. 1166/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council accompanied by the National Methodological Report to the deadlines set in the grant agreement and the Annual National Statistical Programme 2014.

**7. Accessibility and clarity**[Top](#)

-

**7.1. Dissemination format - News release**

[Not requested]

**7.2. Dissemination format - Publications****Regular and ad-hoc publications in which data are made available to the public****7.2.a The nature of publications**

*Please specify the nature of publications. For example, the publications can contain preliminary results or final results, can be technical reports, etc.*

*Please also specify if the publications contain metadata.*

The final results of FSS 2013 will be available at the end of 2014. These will be disseminated as follows:

► At national level through:

Press release on 15 December 2014

Publication in 2 volumes (book + CD) on 30 December 2014:

Volume 1: "Farm Structure Survey 2013 – General data at national level"

Volume 2: "Farm Structure Survey 2013 – Data by macro-region, development region and county"

The publications are bilingual, Romanian/English and contain tables with results at national level and by macro-region/development region/county accompanied by methodological specifications and metadata.

► At Eurostat level, the following will be transmitted on 15 December 2014:

Eurofarm file with FSS 2013 microdata accompanied by the National Methodological Report

**7.2.b Date of issuing (actual or planned)**

30 December 2014

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

Version in Romanian: <http://www.insse.ro/cms/ro/content/ancheta-structural%C4%83-%C3%AEn-agricultur%C4%83-2013>

Version in English: <http://www.insse.ro/cms/en/content/ancheta-structural%C4%83-%C3%AEn-agricultur%C4%83-2013>

**7.3. Dissemination format - online database**

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

There is no on-line database. A selection of tables with results at national level and by macro-region/development region/county is available on NIS website for consultation purposes.

**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.

There is no accounting of the number of consultations of on-line data tables

#### 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.

The statistical tools available on NIS website consists of:

- Data collection questionnaire
- Interviewer's handbook
- Methodological guide

##### 7.5.b Main scientific references

Please provide references.

-

##### 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.

National Methodological Report

#### 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.

There exist no differences between the national definition and the EU one of Regulation (EC) No. 1166/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council.

##### 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 are no differences between the population covered by the national survey and the population covered by the registrations 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.*

To organise FSS 2013, the „Handbook on implementing the FSS and SAPM definitions – REV 10” was used. There occurred no differences between the national definitions and the EU ones as regards the characteristics or their classification.

The number of hours used for a full time-employee to calculate the annual work unit was of 1 960 hours.

The range of days in the validation rules, using in order to establish the percentage bands was:

$0 < X < 61 \rightarrow$  „24”

$61 \leq X < 122 \rightarrow$  „49”

$122 \leq X < 183 \rightarrow$  „74”

$183 \leq X < 245 \rightarrow$  „99”

$X = 245 \rightarrow$  „100”

### **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.*

In Romania, the common land represents only the area covered with pastures and meadows under the administration of commune halls, being used in various forms: tenant farming, concession or against payment of a tax.

In the FSS 2013 case, the common land was registered as area utilised and administered by the commune halls, despite the land being used by other holdings to avoid double-counting.

Taking into account this aspect, a special code for the legal status, “Town halls”, was created into the FSS 2013 questionnaire, under Chapter I, Section 2.2., code “8”, in order that the common land units to be easier to be identified.

There were not created any other specific questions in the questionnaire, or other questionnaire specifically designed for common land units. The coordinators of FSS 2013 were trained in order that the respondents of the involved units to complete properly that information. For avoiding double-counting, all the holdings, other than those with legal status “8”, that utilised common land did not record that area into their questionnaire.

The common land units may also have however other additional land, recorded under arable land crops, permanent crops, unutilised agricultural land, wooded land, but this area was not considered as common land.

In conclusion, all the units with code “8” – “Town halls”, having pastures and meadows area were considered in “eurofarm” file as “common land units”, and the common land area was represented by their total area with pastures and meadows.

In most of cases, the common land was recorded as "UAA for farming by owner". There were also 8 units for which the common land was recorded as "UAA for farming by tenant" and 79 units for which the common land was "UAA for shared farming or other modes".

#### 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.*

When collecting the data on the common land no specific problems were encountered, these being registered according to the „Handbook on implementing the FSS and SAPM definitions – REV 10” .

#### 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 table hereunder presents the common land statistics by land type:

Variable	Area (ha)
Pastures and meadows (excluding rough grazing)	1253488,76
Pastures and meadows on rough grazing	96886,70
Pastures and meadows not used for production purposes and eligible for subsidies	164258,93
<b>COMMON LAND (TOTAL PASTURES AND MEADOWS)</b>	<b>1514634,39</b>

#### 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.*

In the table hereunder it is presented the situation containing the number of the common land units, splitted by each category of the common land. It is necessary to mention that are agricultural holdings having more than one category of pastures and meadows.

Variable	Holdings (number)
Pastures and meadows (excluding rough grazing)	2363
Pastures and meadows on rough grazing	282
Pastures and meadows not used for production purposes and eligible for subsidies	369
<b>COMMON LAND (TOTAL PASTURES AND MEADOWS)</b>	<b>2724</b>

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

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

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

The location of the agricultural holding is defined in article 2 of Regulation (EC) No. 1166/ 2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council: “*location of a holding means the latitude and longitude coordinates within an arc of 5 minutes that avoid the direct identification of an individual holding. If a latitude and longitude location contains only one agricultural holding, then this holding shall be attributed to a neighbouring location, which contains at least one other agricultural holding.*”

The methodology relative to the geographical reference of the holding was developed through the Multi-Beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme: “*Grant Agreement between the European Community and NIS Romania*” within the ESTAT N<sup>o</sup>:40201.2012.200-202012.993 contract.

According to this methodology every holding is assigned the geographical coordinates of the locality centroid (NUTS 5), based on the locality code (NUTS 5 level), mentioned on the FSS 2013 questionnaire.

The file containing the geographical coordinates of the locality centroid (NUTS 5) was provided by the National Agency for Cadastre and Land Registration.



The methodology used is in agreement with the requirements of Regulation (EC) No. 1166/2008, establishing the framing of the latitude and longitude coordinates within an arc of 5 minutes and it was implemented for the General Agricultural Census 2010.

#### **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 reference system used was ETRS89 (European Terrestrial Reference System 1989)

#### **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).*

The rounding of the coordinates was not used, for each holding being transmitted the exact coordinates

#### **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 - Eurostat recommends this option, whenever possible;*
- *the building (administrative, for livestock or other production);*
- *the most important parcel (in terms of production);*
- *the residence of the farmer (if it is not further than 5 km from the farm).*

The holding was located where most of or all agricultural activities are performed.

The holding location was made by a strict observance of the elements hierarchically shown below according to:

- The most important parcel
- Location where most of the holding agricultural activities take place
- Address of the holder

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

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

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

There are no differences among the national rules for certifying organic products and those foreseen in the Council Regulation No. 834/2007

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

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

[Not requested]

#### **8.2. Comparability - over time**

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

*Please indicate the relevant case from the ones below:*

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

- b. There have been some changes but not enough to warrant the designation of a break in series.  
 c. There have been sufficient changes to warrant the designation of a break in series.  
 In the second and third cases, please indicate the changes, the reasons and their impact on the comparability over time.  
 Particularly in the third case, please indicate any information relevant for users.

There were no deviations from the previous holding definition so the data are fully comparable.

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

Please indicate the relevant case from the ones below:

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

There are no changes.

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

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

Please indicate the relevant case from the ones below:

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

There were no differences regarding the definitions, the reference moment or the characteristics measurement between the data obtained from other farm structure surveys.

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

This item is applicable when at least one of the two surveys whose results are compared is carried out as a sample survey.

Please indicate any information relevant for users.

There were no significant alterations attributable to the sampling variability.

### 8.2.e Common Land

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

Please specify possible changes and reasons.

When collecting the data about the common land, there occurred no changes in the data collection methodology versus the previous survey, this registration being made according to the „Handbook on implementing the FSS and SAPM definitions – REV 10”.

Thus, special holdings were set up for the commune halls having registered the whole area of pastures and meadows within a locality jointly used by various agricultural holdings either without or with legal personality.

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

Please specify.

There are no significant differences concerning the area and the number of holdings with common land (thsd. ha)

	UM	FSS 2010	FSS 2013	Difference 2013/2010 %

Area with common land	thsd. ha	1498	1515	+ 1.1
Holdings	number	2651	2724	+ 2.8

### 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.

Main characteristics	FSS 2010	FSS 2013	Difference 2013/2010 %	Comments
Number of holdings	3859043	3629656	-5,9	
UAA (ha)	13306128,33	13055849,80	-1,9	
Arable land (ha)	8306416,49	8197590,35	-1,3	
Pastures and meadows (ha)	4506253,20	4398346,4	-2,4	
Permanent crops (ha)	311433,27	302473,86	-2,9	
Arable set-aside land (ha)	952515,36	671746,43	-29,5	The set aside areas decreased because the farmers are interested to receive subsidies for the cultivated land
Livestock numbers (livestock unit)	5445521,399	4975309,161	-8,6	
Bovines (heads)	1989794	1936457	-2,7	
Family labour force (number of persons)	7051296	6492627	-7,9	

#### 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

Comparisons were made at micro level against the data obtained from the surveys on main crops, livestock and animal production for certain holdings scoring extreme values for some characteristics (durum wheat, rice, poultry, horses, ostriches etc.).

In case of large differences between data sources, the units with very high values of indicators have been re-contacted, through the coordinators from Statistical County Offices and, if necessary, corrections were made, or on the contrary there were reconfirmed the initial values.

#### 8.3.b Comparisons at macro level

The results were assessed by comparing the main data obtained at the national level from FSS 2013 against the data obtained from the other agricultural surveys, as follows:

a) Comparing the final results of FSS 2013 with the data obtained from the Agricultural Crop Survey (ACS) 2013, as follows:

AREA	FSS 2013 ha	ACS 2013 ha	Differences ACS versus FSS (%)
UAA	13055850	13904637	+ 6.50
Arable land	8197590	8746380	+ 6.69
Pastures and meadows	4398346	4716885	+ 7.24

When analysing the FSS 2013 and ACS 2013 data, one can notice very close results, the differences between the two statistical surveys being fairly small within the permissible 10 % limit for all UAA categories.

b) After comparing the results of FSS 2013 and those of the livestock and animal production survey 2013 (LAPS 2013), the following findings were made:

SPECIES	FSS 2013 heads	LAPS 2013 heads	Differences % LAPS against FSS
Bovines	1936457	2022408	+ 4.44
Pigs	4234549	5180173	+ 22.33
Sheep	8944502	9135678	+ 2.14
Goats	1325531	1312967	- 0.95
Poultry	76301194	79440251	+ 4.11

The data related to the main animal species resulted from FSS 2013, compared to those obtained from the livestock and animal production survey-LAPS 2013 show insignificant differences for bovines, sheep, goats, poultry and bigger ones for pigs.

Mention must be made that the livestock numbers for FSS 2013 are registered on 31 December and for LAPS 2013 on 1 December. The 22.3 % differential for pigs is explainable by the fact that some of the pigs were slaughtered during Christmas time when, traditionally, every family slaughters a pig. The relatively small difference, of less than 10 %, between the FSS 2013 data and those obtained from the other annual agricultural surveys both in the crop and animal sector is another factor certifying the quality of the concerned results.

## 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 statistics are not reconcilable with those obtained through other data sources or statistical domains, from some reasons, such as: precision requirement, different target populations or reference periods.

#### 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 agricultural holdings with legal personality are exhaustively surveyed by self-registered questionnaires for all agricultural surveys. The agricultural holdings without legal personality are generally such chosen as not to take part simultaneously in several surveys having the same type of questions.

## 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.*

In National Institute of Statistics there is a committee for confidentiality, which has developed general rules and depending on the requirements, they are analyzed and given to from case to case, based on a written commitment.

### 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 aggregated data does not allow that an agricultural holding to be identified through dissemination. In special cases, in order to avoid situations that don't ensure the confidentiality, neighboring intervals will join to form a single interval, containing more agricultural holdings.

## 12. Statistical processing

[Top](#)

### Survey organisation and calendar

*Please provide **brief** information on:*

The FSS principal activities are presented in the **General FSS 2013 organisation and conduct programme**

<b>Crt. no.</b>	<b>ACTIVITY</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	<b>BODY</b>
1	Development of the General Programme for FSS 2013 organisation and conduct	28.01.2013	DSAM
2	Establishing the list of observation variables	15.02.2013	DSAM
3	Designing the data collection questionnaire, the Interviewer's Handbook, the methodological guide and the locality nomenclature (SIRUTA)	01.03.2013	DSAM
4	Sample drawing (around 10% of the total holdings)	15.05.2013	DSAM
5	Finalising the statistical tools – data collection questionnaire, interviewer's handbook, methodological guide, SIRUTA	16.05.2013	DSAM
6	Approval by NIS management of the statistical tools for FSS	20.05.2013	DSAM

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

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

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

*1. definition of survey objective and requirements:*

*1.1. formation of workgroups for survey organisation;*

*1.2. consultation of users;*

*1.3. set-up objectives, target population, statistical units, classifications, precision requirements etc.;*

*1.4. survey promotion.*

*2. survey design:*

*2.1. set-up organisation of the survey (e.g. detailed timetable, specification of resources, costs estimation);*

*2.2. definition of the survey variables;*

*2.3. design of the sampling frame and sampling procedures;*

*2.4. design of data collection procedures (e.g. questionnaire design, selection of data collection modes etc.);*

*2.5. design of data processing procedures (e.g. CATI/CAPI/CAWI input programmes etc.);*

*2.6. pilot survey organisation and execution.*

*3. data collection:*

*3.1. sampling frame construction and sample selection;*

*3.2. recruitment of interviewers;*

*3.3. training of interviewers;*

*3.4. fieldwork;*

*3.5. evaluation and assessment of fieldwork.*

*4. data processing and validation:*

*4.1. data entry and data coding;*

*4.2. data validation (at record level);*

*4.3. data correction and imputation.*

*5. data compilation:*

*5.1. weight calculation and estimation;*

*5.2. calculation of derived variables;*

*5.3. calculation of quality indicators (e.g.*

	2013		
7	Approval by NIS management of the number of printing copies for FSS 2013 statistical tools	27.05.2013	DSAM
8	Drawing up the specification book for statistical tools printing	17.06.2013	DSAM, DAISAG
9	Establishing the IT requirements at county and central level	01.07.2013	DSAM, DGITIS
10	Launching the call for tender and contracting the statistical tools printing	10.07.2013	DAISAG
11	Handing over the statistical tools for printing	15.07.2013	DSAM
12	Drafting the specification book for purchasing the IT applications necessary to process the data at county and central level	19.07.2013	DSAM, DGITIS DAISAG
13	Sending to the county offices the sample of agricultural holdings	01.08.2013	DSAM
14	Launching the call for tender for purchasing the IT applications necessary for data processing at county and central level	16.09.2013	DAISAG
15	Printing the statistical tools and their dissemination at county level	21.10.2013	Outsourced service
16	Recruiting and hiring additional staff at county level (survey coordinators)	01.11.2013	DSAM, DTS
17	Selection and training of the interviewers	15.11.2013	DSAM, DTS
18	Design, making and testing of the IT application to process the data at county and central level	29.11.2013	DGITIS, Outsourced service
19	Data collection in the field	10.01 - 10.02.2014	DTS(interviewers)
20	Collecting the questionnaires filled in at county level and their manual validation	28.02.2014	DTS
21	Recruiting, hiring and training of the IT application operators at territorial level (computer operators)	03.03 - 31.03.2014	DSAM, DTS
22	Finalising the data entry and data validation at county level	31.07.2014	DTS
	Transmission of the data files		

*non-response rates, relative standard errors, coverage errors, bias etc.);*  
*5.4. aggregation and tabulation;*  
*5.5. validation of aggregated data.*

6. *data analysis*

7. *data dissemination*

23	to NIS head office Data control at NIS level; developing the control tables	31.07.2014	DTS
24	for analysis and comparison with other sources; solving the errors	04.08.2014	DSAM, DGITIS
25	Analysis of centralised data by automatic procedures and making automatic corrections	29.08.2014	DSAM, DGITIS
26	Data expansion, applying the redressing and recalibration procedures to the grossing up coefficients	30.09.2014	DSAM
27	Sending the main indicators to the county offices after data expansion	06.10.2014	DSAM
28	Validation of the results	31.10.2014	DSAM
29	Press release	15.12.2014	DSAM
30	Transmission of Eurofarm file to EUROSTAT	15.12.2014	DSAM
31	Drafting of the publications Vol 1: "Farm structure survey 2013 – General data at national level“ and Vol 2: "Farm structure survey 2013 – Data by macro region/development region/county“	30.12.2014	DSAM
<p><b>ACRONYMS</b></p> <p>FSS – Farm structure survey</p> <p>DTS – County statistical offices</p> <p>DSAM – Department of Agricultural and Environment Statistics</p> <p>DGITIS – General Department for IT and Statistical Infrastructure</p> <p>DAISAG – Department for Purchases, Investment and General Administration Services</p>			

The National Institute of Statistics was charged with the whole organisation and conduct of the concerned survey. The following internal departments were directly involved in the FSS 2013 organisation and conduct:

- At central level: Department of Agricultural and Environment Statistics, General Department for IT and Statistical Infrastructure, Department for the Budget and Accountancy, Department of Human Resources, Department for Purchases, Investment and General Administration Services, Department of European Affairs and International Cooperation
- At county level: all 42 statistical county offices

The main tasks of NIS were:

The following activities were carried out within the Department of

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

Agricultural and Environment Statistics: drafting of legal acts, questionnaire design and interviewer's handbook, establishing the processing requirements at county and central level, data verification and validation, drafting the control tables, IT application use, data integrity analysis, non-response treatment, data expansion, final tables design making, publication preparation and making. The IT application for survey data processing was outsourced to a specialised IT firm.

The recruitment and training of the interviewers, monitoring their activity throughout the survey and reception and analysis of questionnaire filling was the responsibility of the county offices.

Coordinators were designated for the good conduct of the survey at county level, one for each county. They were trained by the county offices staff and in their turn they trained the local interviewers.

The data collection was done by direct interview of the holder or any other adult member of the holding in case of the agricultural holdings without legal personality or on self-administered questionnaire by the holding head or any competent person for the agricultural holdings with legal personality. 3 000 interviewers were hired for FSS 2013 needs and each had to fill in 105 questionnaires on average. As a rule, the interviewers had an agricultural or economic training and most of them took part in the previous structural surveys.

The completed questionnaires were received at county offices level, the data entry being ensured by additionally-hired staff. Also the county offices provided the first data validation. The county offices sent the data files to the centre where the other survey stages took place until obtaining the final results.

The data processing was performed as follows:

- at county level:

- the data inputting (by additionally-hired staff), data validation, error solving, comparison with other sources, data integrity control, control tables, sending the files with correct data to the centre;

- at central level:

- data files reception from the county offices, data validation, error solving, control tables, non-response treatment, data expansion, estimations of the main characteristics at county level and sending them for validation to the county offices, final estimations of all the surveyed characteristics, making the final tables, the publications and the Eurofarm file in order to send it to Eurostat in the specific format.

The county offices activity related to FSS 2013 was monitored by the FSS-2013 team kept informed about the survey progress on a weekly basis.

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

All the FSS 2013-connected activities were carried out in accordance with the General FSS 2013 organisation and conduct programme.

**12.1. Source data**

**12.1.a Target population**

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

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

The definition of the agricultural holding respects the definition established in Regulation (EC) No. 1166/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council on farm structure surveys and the survey on agricultural production



methods, namely:

The agricultural holding as a statistical observation unit represents a techno-economic agricultural unit carrying out its activity under a single current management and performing agricultural activities by using agricultural areas and/or animal husbandry or activities meant to maintain the agricultural land in good agricultural and environmental conditions either as a main activity or as a secondary one.

The concerned agricultural activities are the following:

- cultivation of non-permanent crops
- cultivation of permanent crops
- crop breeding
- mushroom cultivation
- animal breeding
- crop cultivation combined with animal breeding
- agricultural land maintained in good agricultural and environmental conditions.

The following categories of units are considered agricultural holdings only if they carry out agricultural activities as well:

- stables for racing/riding/galloping horses (i.e. the land used for riding horses training)
- fairs, slaughter houses (without animal breeding)
- hunting, forestry and logging
- fish breeding

**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.*

According to the EU definition, the number of holdings determined after the General Agricultural Census (GAC) 2010 was of 3 859 043 holdings out of whom 3 828 345 agricultural holdings without legal personality and 30 698 agricultural holdings with legal personality.

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

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

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

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

The target population was made up of all the holdings on Romanian territory the way they were registered during GAC 2010. No physical thresholds were applied to ensure the 98 % coverage of UAA and/or 98 % of the LSU.

**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).*

The number of holdings in the nationally-covered population was of 3 629 656 holdings of whom 3 601 776 agricultural holdings without legal personality and 27 880 agricultural holdings with legal personality.

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

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

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

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

The number of holdings in the population covered by the registrations transferred to Eurostat was of 3 629 656 holdings, of whom 3 601 776 agricultural holdings without legal personality and 27 880 agricultural holdings with legal personality.

#### **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.*

In the records sent to Eurostat, there are 6 320 holdings with standard output equal to zero. Most of these holdings have UAA, but their standard output is equal to zero as no standard output was calculated for the concerned areas (e.g. set-aside agricultural land, kitchen gardens etc), as follows:

- 6306 holdings with fallow land and permanent grassland, no longer used in production and eligible for payment of subsidies, the land for all of them being maintained in good agricultural and environmental conditions;
- 8 records with male rabbits (and some holdings with scattered trees), characteristics which are eligible, but not valued with SO coefficients;
- 6 records with hamsters, guinea pigs and chinchilla, grown for reproduction and for marketing - characteristics which are eligible only in the national survey.

#### **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.*

To meet the requirements stipulated in art. 3.2 and 3.3 of Regulation (EC) No. 1166/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council on farm structure surveys and the survey on agricultural production methods, no physical thresholds were used to cover 98 % of UAA and 98 % of the LSU.

#### **12.1.b Source of data**

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

FSS 2013 was a sample survey, based on a sample representative at national/macro region/development region/county level (NUTS3).

#### **12.1.c (Sampling) frame**

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

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

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

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

The source of the frame is Farm Register (FR).

##### **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.*

The sampling frame is a list frame of agricultural holdings.

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

The Farm Register is updated according to the GAC 2010 results and the information obtained through the annual surveys on crops and livestock.

### 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.

The FSS 2013 sample was drawn according to the probabilistic stratified random sampling method.

#### 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.

Single stage.

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

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

The agricultural holding.

#### 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.

The holdings were stratified according to the following variables:

- county (NUTS 3)
- UAA size class (8 classes)[0-0,1; 0,1- 0,5; 0,5-1; 1-5; 5-10; 10-50; 50-100; >100]
- economic size (6 classes) [0-2000; 2000-10000; 10000-50000; 50000-100000; 100000-500000; 500000 and over].

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

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

For each stratum, the sample was selected by simple random sampling.

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

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

The agricultural holdings with legal personality. were exhaustively surveyed. Beside them, several agricultural holdings without legal personality. were also exhaustively surveyed based on the following requirements:

- for animal statistics indicators: bovines 20 heads and over, sheep 300 heads and over, goats 40 heads and over, pigs – 100 heads and over, poultry – 300 heads and over, horses – 10 heads and over, rabbits – 100 heads and over, at least 200 bee families;
- for crop statistics indicators: having cultivated tobacco and hops, vegetables, melons and strawberries under glass and protective cover  $\geq 0,2$  ha, flowers and ornamental plants in the field and under glass or protective cover  $\geq 0.2$  ha, field strawberries  $\geq 0,2$  ha, fruit trees (apple/pear/plum/apricot/common apricot/pear/nectarine/cherry/sour cherry trees)  $\geq 5$  ha , natural pastures and meadows  $\geq 20$  ha, field vegetables and melons  $\geq 1$  ha, vines  $\geq 2$  ha.

#### 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.*

The representative sample was drawn using the Neyman stratified random method by applying SAS procedures for the agricultural holdings without legal personality and by exhaustive coverage for the agricultural holdings with legal personality.

The final FSS 2013 sample was of about 313 315 agricultural holdings without legal personality and all the agricultural holdings with legal personality. (32106). The total sample size was 345 421 agricultural holding.

#### **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.*

For any new survey a new sample is drawn from the agricultural holdings without legal personality according to the survey specificity.

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

The sample drawing is done with the help of the SAS software.

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

Not applicable

### **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.*

No administrative data sources were used.

#### **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.*

Not applicable.

#### **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	Not applicable
- 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>	Not applicable
- to replace the survey on all characteristics and on a part of the survey population	Not applicable
- 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>	Not applicable
- to build/update the (sampling) frame (used for census	Not applicable

or for sample survey)	
- to pre-fill answers in the questionnaires which are then checked by farmers during the survey	Not applicable
- to impute item/unit non-response	Not applicable
- to validate the survey data (quality control). <i>Please indicate actions taken in case of large discrepancies</i>	Not applicable
- to calibrate of survey estimates. <i>Please indicate the calibration variables</i>	Not applicable
- other ( <i>please specify in the next column</i> )	Not applicable

#### 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.*

Not applicable

#### 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> <i>Please specify the name of the administrative source(s) in this column, along with information required for each row.</i>
<b>-coverage:</b>		
	<b>- over-coverage</b> <i>If the source covers more units than it should, please provide an assessment of the over-coverage rate and mention whether the out-of-scope units were excluded.</i>	Not applicable
	<b>- under-coverage</b> <i>If the source covers less units than it should, please provide an assessment of the extent of under-coverage (if possible) and mention if and how the missing information is derived.</i>	Not applicable
	<b>- misclassification</b>	

<i>Please mention whether the information allows for the requested classification of units and whether there are errors in classification variables.</i>	Not applicable
<b>- multiple listings</b> <i>Please provide an assessment on units which were present more than once in the source and specify how the duplicates were eliminated.</i>	Not applicable
<b>- rate of unreported events</b> <i>If data of the System for the Identification and Registration of Bovine Animals is used, please provide an assessment of the rate of unreported events. Unreported events refer to births, deaths or loss, sales or change of owners etc. of animals, which create under – and/or over-coverage errors for the estimates of animals.</i>	Not applicable
<b>- missing data</b> (analogue to item and unit non-response errors in a survey). <i>Please provide an assessment of missing data, specify for which characteristics and how it was accounted for (e.g. by imputation).</i>	Not applicable
<b>- errors in register variables</b> (analogue to measurement errors in a survey) i.e. erroneous values for certain variables	Not applicable
<b>- processing errors.</b> <i>Please provide an assessment. You can mention here imputation methods used, if any.</i>	Not applicable
<b>- coherence</b> (comparison to other available data) of the administrative data (ex-ante and/or ex-post)	Not applicable
<b>- other drawbacks (if any)</b> of the use of data from the administrative source. <i>Please specify the drawbacks in the next column.</i>	Not applicable

[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.*

The data collection takes place in the years when farm structure surveys are conducted in accordance with the Regulation (EC) No. 1166/ 2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council, namely in 2010 in a census survey and in 2013 and 2016 in a sample survey.

## 12.3. Data collection

### 12.3.a Data collection modes

*Please specify the data collection mode(s) used.*

*These can be for example:*

- Telephone

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

- Face-to-face

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

- Internet

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

- *Self-completed paper questionnaires*

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

- *Mixed-mode*

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

The data collection for FSS 2013 was done by direct face-to-face interview with the holder or one of its adult members for the agricultural holdings without legal personality and on self-registered questionnaires under the coordinator's guidance for the agricultural holdings with legal personality. About 3000 interviewers were hired for FSS 2013 with an average norm of 105 questionnaires per interviewer. Normally, the interviewers had an agricultural or economic training and most of them already participated in the other previous farm structure surveys.

### 12.3.b Data entry modes

*Please specify the data entry mode(s) used.*

*These can be, for example:*

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

The data entry was decentralised at county office level through data typing into the computer by operators. To this purpose, 126 computer operators were hired, the data being entered manually.

### 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.*

To increase the response rate, several measures were taken targeting:

- The duty to prove the official position as interviewer by showing the personal card when first visiting the agricultural holdings without legal personality
- Interviewing a competent person within the agricultural holdings without legal personality, preferably the holder or any other adult member of the holding in full working capacity
- Avoiding taking the interview in front of people who do not belong to the respective holding by explaining the fact that the information is confidential and can only be used for statistical purposes
- Handing over a basic unfilled questionnaire to the interviewee so that he/she may follow the questions more easily. After the data are filled in, the basic unfilled questionnaire must be returned.
- Getting precise and sincere replies, the questions were clearly and politely formulated
- In case the questions have several answering variants, the interviewee was shown a complete list of those so he/she may choose the correct variant
- The interviewee must not be interrupted before finishing to answer even that he/she hesitates (the hesitation may be due to the fact that the respondent tries to remember various aspects related to the information requested)
- Interviewer's return to the holdings that could not be contacted
- Re-contacting the respondents (in the case of agricultural holdings without legal personality)

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

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

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

*The following table aims to collect exact information of the number of holdings in a uniform way. This information allows,*

among other, calculating response rates according to the definition of response rates in the Eurostat (2009) [ESS Handbook for Quality Reports](#), page 49. These definitions of the response rates are presented in the handbook for sample surveys but, as stated in the same handbook, page 57, they are also applicable to censuses.

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

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

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

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

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

1.	<b>Number of holdings in the population covered by the records sent to Eurostat</b> Please note that the survey coverage of the records sent to Eurostat can be different from the national survey coverage in case very low (or no) national thresholds are applied. In case of a census $1=3+4+5$	3629656
2.	<b>Number of holdings in the gross sample</b> The number of holdings selected from the sampling frame to be included in the sample. This item should be completed <u>only</u> in case of a sample survey, in which case $2=3+4+5$	345421
3.	<b>(new) Number of ineligible holdings</b> The number of surveyed holdings which result to be out-of-scope (the frame is not updated and the data collection reveals that some holdings e.g. fall below set thresholds during the reference period), which do not exist at the selected address, which have the activities ceased during the reference period etc.	12076
3.1	<b>Number of holdings with ceased activities</b> This item is a subset of 3. $3.1 \geq 3.1.1 + 3.1.2$	7385
3.1.1	<b>Number of holdings which definitively ceased i.e. the land is abandoned.</b> This item should be completed only if information is available.	7358
3.1.2	<b>Number of holdings with ceased activities following the change of manager</b> This item should be completed only if information is available.	-
4	<b>(new) Number of holdings with unknown eligibility status</b> The number of surveyed holdings which could not be contacted (e.g. in a CATI survey) and for which it is not certain if they are eligible (e.g. in scope) or not.	10631



<b>5</b>	<b>(new) Number of eligible holdings</b> <i>The number of surveyed holdings which are eligible</i> <b>5=5.1+5.2</b>	322714
<b>5.1</b>	<b>Number of non-responding holdings</b> <i>The number of eligible holdings which:</i> - were contacted but refused to take part in the survey; - were contacted but were unable to participate in the survey for various reasons; - participated in the survey but the entire survey form cannot be used because of poor quality etc. <i>This item refers to holdings for which no data is collected (unit non-response).</i> <b>5.1&gt;=5.1.1+5.1.2</b>	1624
<b>5.1.1</b>	<b>Number of non-responding holdings – re-weighted</b>	1133
<b>5.1.2</b>	<b>Number of non-responding holdings – imputed</b>	491
<b>5.2</b>	<b>Number of responding holdings</b> <i>This item includes holdings which provided completed questionnaires, either entirely or partially.</i>	321090

**12.3.e Questionnaire(s)**

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

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

**Annexes:**

[English version of Questionnaire for FSS 2013 data collection](#)

**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.*

The data check took place in several stages throughout the survey conduct:

The FSS-2013 data control was gradually performed, as follows:

- The control made by the coordinators designated at county office level. This control took place soon as the filled questionnaires were collected from the interviewers. This stage was focused on:

- observance of the work methodology
- reliability of the questionnaire-registered data (correlations among indicators, comparisons with other sources, agreement with the sample etc.)
- observance of questionnaire filling-in rules.

Automatic control achieved by the IT application at county office level: The IT application was designed according to the processing requirements for the validation rules and the correlations established to enter the questionnaires into the database. The use of this application determines the input and logic validation of the questionnaire-registered data and if

necessary the drawing up of a checklist. The validation rules included in the IT application contained checkings for every questionnaire chapter and among chapters. These lists were analysed by authorised staff and corrections were made where appropriate.

- Automatic control performed by the IT application at central level.

The data centralised at NIS head office underwent an automatic control following the same procedures as at county office level. The errors spotted were also solved at county office level and the correct files were retransferred to NIS.

- Automatic control of data integrity, completeness and other aspects originally not included in the processing requirements. Automatic procedures were developed to analyse the agreement between database data and the ones in the sample taking into account the non-response and also procedures for analysing the data completeness against the completeness code and other analysing procedures for correlations and limits. Following such analyses automatic corrections were applied to the database.
- Data control at central level in comparison with other sources. To this purpose, a specialist team was formed at NIS level in order to achieve the check of the centralised expanded data versus other sources: GAC 2010, other current own surveys etc. In this stage, one could detect the situations when the estimator caused biases in certain variables and consequently, adjustment and recalibration methods and procedures were used for the grossing up coefficients.
- The Validation Rules included in the Data Supplier Manual were used to validate the Eurofarm file.

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

*Please mention tools used.*

The data were validated by means of several tools:

- manual control of the questionnaire-registered data
- automatic control made by the IT application through the validation rules implemented
- control by control tables
- checking the extreme values in the database.

#### **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.*

The stages mentioned at item 12.4.a occurred at different levels:

- at interviewer's and coordinator's level:
  - observance of work methodology
  - reliability of questionnaire-registered data (correlations among indicators, comparisons with other sources, agreement with the sample, etc.)
  - observance of questionnaire filling rules
- at county office level:
  - automatic control made by the IT application
- at central level
  - automatic control made by the IT application after the validation rules
  - comparing the results with other data sources

### **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.*

The grossing up coefficient was obtained as the probability reverse. This coefficient was calculated as the ratio between the number of units in the sampling frame and the number of units in the sample by each stratum.

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

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

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

An adjustment of grossing up coefficients related to each stratum was made for the non-response by estimating the ratio between the non-response and the number of units in the respective stratum.

**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.*

Not applicable

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

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

Not applicable

**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)**

Not applicable

**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 extreme weather conditions during the agricultural year or differences in methodology across regions were present

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

*Please suggest possible improvements.*

N/A

**13.c Other annexes**

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

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

N/A

<b>Related metadata</b>	<a href="#">Top</a>

<b>Annexes</b>	<a href="#">Top</a>