

# 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. Štatistický úrad Slovenskej republiky (National Statistical Office of Slovakia)

Time Dimension: 2013-A0

Data Provider: SK1

Data Flow: FSS\_ESQRS\_A:1.0

## Eurostat metadata

### Reference metadata

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

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

[Download](#)

## 1. Contact

[Top](#)

<b>1.1. Contact organisation</b>	<p><i>Please provide the name of the organisation of the contact points for the data or metadata.</i></p> <p>Štatistický úrad Slovenskej republiky (National Statistical Office of Slovakia)</p>
<b>1.2. Contact organisation unit</b>	<p><i>Please specify an addressable subdivision of an organisation.</i></p> <p>Section of Business Statistics / Unit of Agriculture</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>Bratislava Miletičova 3, 824 67 Bratislava</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)*

Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic since 2001 regularly carries out Farm structure surveys. In surveys carried out in the years 2001, 2003, 2005 and 2007, we used for the classification of farms the same thresholds:

- a/ area of utilized agricultural area (UAA) at least 0,5 ha,
- b/ area of intensive crops (orchards or vegetables or flowers) at least 1500 m<sup>2</sup>,
- c/ area of vineyards at least 500 m<sup>2</sup>
- d/ number of livestock - 1 head of beef cattle or 2 heads of pigs or 4 heads of sheep or goats or 50 heads of poultry,
- e/ number of fur animals at least 100 heads or 100 heads of rabbits or 5 colonies of bees.

The threshold values for determining farms were amended in 2010 and remained also in force even for the survey in 2013:

- a/ area of utilized agricultural area (UAA) at least 1,0 ha,
- b/ area of vineyards, orchards and nurseries at least 0,5 ha,
- c/ area of tobacco, hops, vegetables, flowers, melons, strawberries and covered areas at least 0,1 ha,
- d/ number of livestock at least 1 head of cattle or 3 heads of pigs or 5 heads of goats or sheep or 100 heads of poultry.

A common characteristic for all surveys carried out so far is that surveys were carried out as the census for legal persons, registered natural persons and households with UAA above 5 ha and sample survey was carried out on farms engaged in agricultural activity with an UAA less than 5 ha, which include mostly farms undertaking agricultural activities for their own consumption.

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

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

- the reference of the national legal base of the FSS survey (Act, Government Decree, etc.)	The basic Slovak legal norm for the area of state statistics is the Act No. 540/2001 Coll. on State Statistics. Statistical surveys are conducted on the base the Program of Surveys that is compiled by the Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic in cooperation with ministries and state bodies for three-year period and is issued in the form of a decree 60 days before coming into force.
- the scope and the coverage of the survey	The survey covers agricultural holdings in the territory of Slovak Republic
- the frequency and the reference period of the survey	Periodicity - according to Regulation 1166/2008 - year of survey 2013 Reference period of the survey – from 1/11/2012 to 31/10/2013
- the responsibility for the survey	The Statistical Office of the SR was a body responsible for the survey realization.
- the administrative and financial provisions	The basic characteristic of the survey outlines Decree 358/2011 Coll. of the Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic, issuing the Program of State Statistical Surveys for the years 2012 to 2014, as amended and financial provisions - EU grant.
- the obligations of the respondents with respect to the survey	The Act on State Statistics (540/2001 Coll.) deals also with obligations of respondents in relation to statistical surveys and sets sanctions, if obligations are not fulfilled.
- the identification, protection and obligations of survey enumerators	- survey enumerators were not involved to the survey in 2013
- the right of access to administrative data	Act on State Statistics (540/2001 Coll.) provides access to data from other organizations
- confidentiality provisions	- data protection is governed by the internal directive SME-5/2012 and methodical directions MET-1/2012 of the SO SR

### 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).

We have included national characteristics only in the group of livestock characteristics. We use more detailed structure as is required and survey it for our own needs which is to obtain through structural survey information on the structure of animals kept in households (self-supply farms). For these farms other survey is not realised. Characteristics serve for the comparability of data with other data from previous surveys FSS resp. FSC and for the needs of National Agricultural and Food Centre, branch: Research Institute of Agriculture and Food Economics.

##### 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.

Data for the reference period from 1<sup>st</sup> November 2012 to 31<sup>st</sup> October 2013 were collected.

Exceptions are characteristics for animals. Total numbers of animals at the date of 31<sup>st</sup> October 2013 and characteristics on support for rural development 2011, 2012 and 2013 were surveyed.

#### 4.2. Relevance - User Satisfaction

[Not requested]

#### 4.3. Completeness

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Non-existing characteristics : 1.02.01.02, 1.03.01.03, 1.03.02.03.09, 1.03.02.03.10, 2.01.01.07, 2.01.06.03, 2.01.06.11, 2.01.07.01.02, 2.04.01.01.02, 2.04.02, 2.04.03, 2.04.04.04

Fibre crops (not only other but the total) are not cultivated on our farms and evenly no manufacturing industry in Slovakia exists. Other indicators NE we consult with research institute and was confirmed that marked items are actually in Slovakia NE items.

Non-existing characteristics in a data file are filled with zero.

All other characteristics have been included in survey. In the file we do not have characteristics which are reported together with other characteristics, therefore do not affect the value of the calculated SO coefficient.

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

## Annexes:

[Non-existent characteristics](#)

### 4.3.1. Data completeness - rate

[Not requested]

## 5. Accuracy and reliability

[Top](#)

-

### 5.1. Accuracy - overall

#### Main sources of error

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

Due to the low value of the standard deviation, sampling errors are negligible. Impact on quality can have non-response, which reached in households with UAA < 5 ha value of 12.3%.

### 5.2. Sampling error

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

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

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

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

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

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

The relative standard error is the standard error divided by the point estimate, multiplied by 100.

## Annexes:

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

[5.2.b RSE](#)

### 5.2.1. Sampling error - indicators

#### 5.2.1.a Relative standard errors (RSEs)

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

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

The cases where precision requirements are applicable are identified with the information provided in section 5.2.a. For those cases, the requirement is that the estimated RSEs are below the thresholds stipulated in Annex IV "Precision

Requirements" of the Regulation 1166/2008. However, in some of these cases, estimated RSEs might be above the thresholds. In the latter cases, please provide justifications.

All RSEs values are below the thresholds stipulated in Annex IV of the Regulation 1166/2008

## Annexes:

### [5.2.1.a Relative standard errors](#)

#### 5.3. Non-sampling error

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

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

#### Assessment of possible bias

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

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

Non-response occurred mainly in farms with UAA less than 5 ha and of them farms undertaking agricultural activities for their own consumption and represents a negligible value of required characteristics.

#### 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.

Units insufficient coverage not recorded.

##### 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.

Units over-coverage are the units, which in the past carried out agricultural activities, but during the data acquisition has shown that they already did not carry out these activity. These are especially the households. The data were corrected due to over-coverage.

Over-coverage units and units with unknown status were removed from the file. Calculation of weights both of these problems takes into account.

##### 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.

Errors due to misclassification we need not to resolve.

##### 5.3.1.d Contact errors

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

Staff of the regional offices ŠÚSR was trained for cases of incomplete contact data. The same staff solved inaccuracies of addresses in cooperation with the local government. The rate of incomplete contact was about 7.7%.

##### 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.

Multiple listings are not present in the survey.

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

N/A

#### 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).*

Over-coverage rate reached 17.5%.

#### 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.*

Measurement errors can cause issues of employment on farms. Elimination of such errors was secured in two ways. In the first place to the software for recording data were embedded control algorithms that were able to detect the most important errors arising from relationships between workers on the farm. When create a file for Eurostat in the process of its creation were build in further algorithms to help detect also other possible errors.

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

All data errors have been corrected, the error rate can not be documented.

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

Data correction was made on the basis of logical relationships and in some cases re-questioning of the respondent.

#### 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.*

We imputed only units with verified information on their activities during the period. These imputations were made in the respective regional offices ŠÚSR. Imputation rate was 3.3% (432 farms) of the total number of eligible farms in the sample.

The part of the reporting units file was created as a sample (household farms). We used re-weighting of responses in this part of the file.

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

*Please mention any characteristic(s) having higher item non-response rate together with the reasons of the item non-response. This information is important and will be useful for the organisation of future surveys.*

*Please also specify how the item non-response was accounted for. Item non-response can be accounted for by e.g. re-weighting, imputation.*

Item non-response was treated in regional offices ŠÚSR. Missing data were obtained by repeated telephone contact with the farm.

Most of item non-response occurred on the labour force characteristics and other gainful activities (OGA).

#### 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).

12.3%

### 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.

After obtaining all additional missing data item non-response rate is 0%.

### 5.3.4. Processing error

#### 5.3.4.a Assessment of processing errors affecting individual observations

Please give a quantitative or qualitative assessment of processing errors.

Any errors in processing were continuously removed.

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

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

Follow-up interviews were conducted with non-response item.

#### 5.3.4.c Imputation methods

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

In the case of unit non-response imputation was used mainly information from our database. Share imputed units is 3.3%.

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

Trained staff of regional workplaces of SO SR.

### 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.

3.3%

### 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.

N/A

### 5.3.6. Data revision

-

### 5.3.6.1. Data revision - policy

#### Brief description of the revision policy

We do not consider to revise the data from previous surveys.

### 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.

We do not consider to revise the data from FSS surveys (in general, including the current FSS survey).

### 5.3.6.3. Data revision - average size

[Not requested]

### 5.3.7. Seasonal adjustment

[Not requested]

## 6. Timeliness and punctuality

[Top](#)

-

### 6.1. Timeliness

See below

#### 6.1.1. Time lag - first result

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

Preliminary data will be published in December 2014, which is - 13 months after the reference period.

#### 6.1.2. Time lag - final result

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

Definitive data will be published in March 2015, which is 16 months after the reference period.

### 6.2. Punctuality

See below

#### 6.2.1. Punctuality - delivery and publication

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

The data are published according to the specified schedule.

## 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.*

Preliminary information contains the main characteristics of survey at the national level according to the legal status of the farm.

First publication will contain the characteristics of the survey according to the legal status of the farm and the regional breakdown by NUTS 3 level.

Second publication will include the typology by NUTS 2.

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

Preliminary in December 2014. Final data in March 2015

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

Final publications - March 2015 – FSS 2013: [complete results](#), [typology](#)



**7.3. Dissemination format - online database**

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

N/A

**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.

-

**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.

Questionnaire and methodological instructions - link: [Pol' 20-93](#)

**7.5.b Main scientific references**

Please provide references.

N/A

**Annexes:**

[Questionnaire and methodological instructions](#)

**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.

N/A

**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.

Between the national and the EU definition of the holding there is no difference.

**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.

Between the population covered in the national survey and the population covered by the records sent to Eurostat there is no difference. The same thresholds have been established.

### 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.*

Definitions are in compliance with the Handbook on implementing the FSS and SAPM definitions – Rev. 10. No different definitions.

The number of hours corresponding to a full-time employee is 1800 hours per year.

### 8.1.d Common land

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

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

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

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

*If you collect information on common land, please describe the methodology by referring to the below options.*

*Combinations of the options are possible; if you use more options, please briefly describe each one.*

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

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

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

*In addition, please specify:*

*- whether there was a set of specific questions in the FSS questionnaire on common land or a separate questionnaire.*

*In the case of a separate questionnaire, it should be attached to this report, section 12.3.e.*

*- (new) how was the common land treated in terms of tenure classification;*

*- (new) how can common land be identified in the data.*

Common land is non-existing in our country.

#### 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.*

-

#### 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.*

-

#### 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.*

-

### 8.1.e. Location of the holding

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

*Please specify from which source you have obtained the origin of the coordinates (the geographical reference of the holding). This is required in the Handbook (document 3.1. Methodology - Handbook on implementing the FSS*

and SAPM definitions - REV 10). For example: cadastre information system, IACS (Integrated Administrative Control System), CAPI (Computer Assisted Personal Interview) with digital maps, address register (address of the farm or of the farmer), LAU2 (village, town, municipality etc.) region of the farm.

Address data, directly surveyed - we surveyed the address, where the main part or the whole agricultural production takes place.

#### 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).

For the transmission of coordinates to Eurostat, we used the European terrestrial reference system 1989 (ETRS89). Since we did not have the coordinates of cadastral information system (which uses national coordinate system S-JTSK and would need to be converted to ETRS89) but addresses of farms on the base of which we obtained coordinates of farms through geo-coding service batchgeo, they were transformed through ArcGIS (ArcCatalog) in the coordinate system ETRS89\_LAEA.

#### 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).

Coordinates provided to Eurostat are not rounded.

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

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

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

NUTS3 region was determined according to the majority of the total area of the holding where the holding is located or if farm has no land, place (settlement) where animals are kept.

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

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

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

No differences

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

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

[Not requested]

#### 8.2. Comparability - over time

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

Please indicate the relevant case from the ones below:

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

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

c. There have been sufficient changes to warrant the designation of a break in series.

In the second and third cases, please indicate the changes, the reasons and their impact on the comparability over time. Particularly in the third case, please indicate any information relevant for users.

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

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

Please indicate the relevant case from the ones below:

a. There have been no changes.

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

c. There have been sufficient changes to warrant the designation of a break in series.

In the second and third cases, please indicate the changes, the reasons and their impact on the comparability over time. Particularly in the third case, please indicate which procedure Eurostat should apply to compare the data over years and any other information relevant for users.

a. There have been no changes. Data comparability with previous survey is not broken.

### **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.

We used a clarification of the methodology for reporting of certain indicators.

### **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.

Data FSS 2013 are comparable (after re-weighting data for the part of the file from the sample survey) with the data of the FSC 2010.

The survey for legal persons, registered natural persons and from subsistence subjects only those with area  $\geq 5$  ha, was carried out as census. For farms with less acreage, a sample survey was designed.

### **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.

-

#### **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.

-

### **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 characteristic	Current FSS survey(2013)	Previous FSC 2010 survey	Difference in %	Comments
Number of holdings;	23566	24463	- 3.7	
UAA (A_3_1), ha;	1901614	1895500	+ 0.32	
Arable land, ha;	1363419	1343506	+ 1.48	
Permanent grassland (B_3), ha;	516811	531274	- 2.7	
Permanent crops (B_4), ha;	18923	19641	- 3.7	
Wooded area (B_5_2), ha;	1108703	1098502	+ 0.92	
Unutilised Agricultural area (B_5_1), ha;	24826	25000	- 0.696	
Fallow land (B_1_12_1+B_1_12_2), ha;	21145	31574	- 33.0	increased acreage of utilised agricultural area for the cultivation of field crops
LSU in LSU;	644825	668337	- 3.6	
Cattle (C_2), head;	468213	464921	+ 0.7	
Family Labour force - in persons;	18270	23877	- 23.5	E_1_3_Persons and E_1_3_AWU – the decrease can be explained by the following reasons: a/ decrease in the number of farms by 6.1% (farms of physical persons) compared to the FSC 2010 b/ significantly increased E_1_6_AWU (number of working days by contractors) at these farms
Family Labour force - in AWU;	4634	5832	- 20.5	
Non family labour force - in persons;	40924	44897	- 8.8	
Non family labour force - in AWU	35063	38439	- 8.8	

### 8.2.1. Length of comparable time series

[Not requested]

### 8.3. Comparability - domain

#### Comparisons with other data sources at micro/macro level

*Other data sources can be for example administrative data, crop production surveys, animal surveys, labour force surveys, National Accounts.*

*If you run comparisons, please give a brief description of the results of these comparisons and possible adjustment made to FSS data. If not, please indicate why not.*

#### 8.3.a Comparisons at micro level

Data were compared at the micro level with data from internal and external sources.

Comparisons with internal data:

- FSS land use with data from regular statistical survey *Inventory of areas sown by agricultural crops on 20th May 2013*,
- FSS main categories of livestock – poultry in total, cattle in total, cows, sheep in total and pigs in total with results from the annual survey on *Inventory of farming animals on 30th November 2013*.
- FSS data were compared with the results of the FSC 2010.

Comparisons with external data:

- FSS list and data of organic farms with the register kept in the Central Controlling and Testing Institute in Agriculture that registers and controls organic farms based on the act.

- FSS obtained data were compared with data from SAPS (Single Area Payment Scheme)  
 - FSS total number of animals was compared with the data from the Central register of livestock. Comparison was made for the following animal - cattle, pigs, sheep and goats.  
 These comparisons were made for all three groups of reporting units such as registered legal persons, registered natural persons and non-registered natural persons (households). Differences were tested during decentralized data processing at the workplaces of the Statistical Office, which carried out the data collection and check.

### 8.3.b Comparisons at macro level

**Comparisons** at the macro level:

- with the FSC 2010 data,
- with data from SAPS,
- with the data from the central register of livestock,
- SO SR internal data.

## 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.*

For entrepreneurial subjects data can be combined with results from other sources. Data for households (subsistence farms) cannot be linked with other data.

#### 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.*

We analyzed all agricultural statistical surveys and all available administrative data sources. Questionnaire of FSS survey we compiled in such a way, that respondent did not need fill in data what can be obtained from other sources.

## 11. Confidentiality

[Top](#)

The confidentiality is required by law. This report should confirm these arrangements.  
 Please provide the requested information, taking into consideration that this report is a non-confidential document.

### 11.1. Confidentiality - policy

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

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

The Act on State Statistics does not allow an access to confidential data for current users. The Statistical Office may



provide confidential data for scientific purposes to legal persons, who have scientific research as a basic mission and provide conditions for their protection.

Data are provided in the form:

a/ complete confidential data are provided only to the MPRV SR (Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development of the Slovak Republic) within the data exchange,

b/ anonymised data which does not allow direct identification of legal or physical persons, to other organisations than the MPRV SR.

## 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).

Data protection in output tables – data are published if the data result from aggregating at least three non-null values from at least three statistical units.

## 12. Statistical processing

[Top](#)

### Survey organisation and calendar

Please provide *brief* information on:

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

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

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

#### 1. definition of survey objective and requirements:

1.1. formation of workgroups for survey organisation;

1.2. consultation of users;

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

1.4. survey promotion.

#### 2. survey design:

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

2.2. definition of the survey variables;

2.3. design of the sampling frame and sampling procedures;

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

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

2.6. pilot survey organisation and execution.

The Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic included the survey in the Program of State Statistical Surveys approved for the period of 2012 - 2014. The Farm Structure Survey 2013 was carried out on the base of the Decree of the Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic No. 103/13/2012 Coll.

Calendar (overview of work progress) :

	Name of task	from	to
1	Preparation of questionnaire and methodological guidelines		May 2013
2	Preparation of technical documentation for decentralized processing		June 2013
3	1st training of supervisors		May 2013
4	2nd training of supervisors		September 2013
5	Creation of the file of reporting units	June 2013	September 2013
6	Distribution of questionnaires		October 2013
7	Debugging of software	October 2013	November 2013

## 3. data collection:

3.1. sampling frame construction and sample selection;

3.2. recruitment of interviewers;

3.3. training of interviewers;

3.4. fieldwork;

3.5. evaluation and assessment of fieldwork.

## 4. data processing and validation:

4.1. data entry and data coding;

4.2. data validation (at record level);

4.3. data correction and imputation.

## 5. data compilation:

5.1. weight calculation and estimation;

5.2. calculation of derived variables;

5.3. calculation of quality indicators (e.g. non-response rates, relative standard errors, coverage errors, bias etc.);

5.4. aggregation and tabulation;

5.5. validation of aggregated data.

## 6. data analysis

## 7. data dissemination

8	Monitoring of data collection – weekly	January 2014	February 2014
9	Collection of questionnaires		March 2014
11	Typing and control of questionnaires	December 2013	July 2014
14	Control and data verification in centre	July 2014	November 2014
15	Typology		October 2014
16	Preparation of data for Eurostat		December 2014
17	Preparation of national report		December 2014
18	Data dissemination		March 2015

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

The Statistical Office of the SR is a responsible body for its realization and work provided by the Department of agricultural statistics. Competencies were divided among working groups from employees of centre in Bratislava and 8 regional workplaces.

Tasks of the centre:

- prepare a timetable of the project,
- prepare a budget,
- set up working groups and to divide their competences,
- prepare a final version of questionnaire and methodological instructions,
- provide printing,
- to prepare a proposal of survey methodology,
- prepare a technical documentation of data processing,
- train supervisors,
- create a file of reporting units,
- test a software,
- monitor data collection,
- data analysis,
- calculation typology of farm,
- publication activity,
- coordination of activities of working groups,
- preparation of data file and other documents for Eurostat.

Competences of regional workplaces:

- cooperation in development of questionnaire and methodological guidelines,
- to test a software,
- distribution printed matters,
- collection of questionnaires,
- typing of questionnaires,

	- data checking.
<b>12.c Serious deviations (if any) from the established calendar and reasons.</b> <i>Please mention only serious deviations with significant consequences on the quality and the transmission time of data to Eurostat.</i>	-
<b>12.1. Source data</b>	
<b>12.1.a Target population</b>	
<b>12.1.a.1 The national definition of an agricultural holding</b> <i>Please mention if the national definition of the holding is as according to the EU definition [3] or not. If not, please mention the national definition of a holding.</i>	
The definition of a farm is by the EU definition, SK uses the same list of agricultural activities for the definition of an agricultural holding, as indicated in Annex I of the Regulation.	
<b>12.1.a.2 The number of holdings in the population disregarding any possible thresholds applied (the entire number of holdings in the country),</b> according to the EU definition of a holding or, if different from the EU definition of a holding, according to the national definition. <i>Please indicate the number. If it is not possible to provide this information, please provide the reasons.</i>	
The total number of farms without applying thresholds in Slovakia in 2013 was not known, because since 2001 we have not done any full census, without thresholds.	
<b>12.1.a.3 The national survey coverage; the thresholds applied in the national survey (if any) and the geographical coverage</b> <i>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).</i>	
Used thresholds for the farm: a/ area of utilized agricultural area (UAA) at least 1,0 ha, b/ area of vineyards, orchards and nurseries at least 0,5 ha, c/ area of tobacco, hops, vegetables, flowers, melons, strawberries and covered areas at least 0,1 ha, d/ number of livestock at least 1 head of cattle or 3 heads of pigs or 5 heads of goats or sheep or 100 heads of poultry. The geographical coverage: - legal persons farms, registered natural persons, households with the area $\geq 5$ ha - complete coverage and level of the republic - households with the area less than 5 ha - sample survey at the level of NUTS3	
<b>12.1.a.4 (new) The number of holdings in the nationally covered population</b> (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. <i>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).</i>	
Number of farms in total - 23 566 including: farms of legal persons – 2 743 farms of natural persons in total – 20 823 including: registered natural persons – 5392 households – 15 431	
<b>12.1.a.5 (new) The survey coverage of the records sent to Eurostat</b> <i>The survey coverage of the records sent to Eurostat can be different from the national survey coverage in case</i>	

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

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

Number of holdings in the population covered by the records is 23 566.

**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.*

Holdings with area only in B\_1\_12\_1 (fallow land without subsidies), B\_1\_12\_2 (fallow land with subsidies) and B\_3\_3 (permanent grassland no longer in production purposes and eligible for the payment of subsidies) keep this area in good agricultural and environmental conditions.

**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.*

- as we use a threshold of UAA of 1 ha, compliance with art. 3.2 is not applicable.

- the used thresholds comply with the physical thresholds referred to by art 3.3.

#### 12.1.b Source of data

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

- legal persons farms, registered natural persons and households with the area  $\geq 5$  ha - complete coverage

- households with the area less than 5 ha - sample survey at the level of 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.*

File of reporting units comprised 13 066 units. This file was created by multiple registers:

- set of farms from 2010
- new farms identified during regular statistical surveys
- new farms from the register of organizations of SO SR
- new farms from external registers:

- register of orchards
- register of vineyards

- register of cattle
- register of pigs
- register of sheep
- register of goats
- register of organic farms
- register of applicants of the Single Area Payment Scheme (SAPS)

### 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.*

Frame for preparation of the sample for the survey were files and registers described in paragraph 12.1.c.1. All registers are list frames at farm level.

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

Period from June 2013 to September 2013.

### 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.*

Stratified random sampling (for the households with the area less than 5 ha).

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

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

One stage (for the households with the area less than 5 ha).

#### 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.*

Household (for the households with the area less than 5 ha).

#### 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 sampling file was divided into two strata. In one are farms of legal persons, registered of natural persons and households with the area  $\geq 5$  ha. Sampling in this stratum was 100%. The second stratum consisted of households with the area less than 5 ha, the sample was of 14.3%. and the stratification variables were NUTS3 and LFA (less favoured areas).

#### 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 the households with the area less than 5 ha we used 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).*

Farms of legal persons, registered natural persons and households with the area  $\geq 5$  ha were fully covered.

#### 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 gross sample of the survey on households with the area less than 5 ha is 3 000 holdings. The total number of farms surveyed (3 000 plus the number of farms with legal persons farms, registered natural persons and households with the area  $\geq 5$  ha) is 17 471 holdings (as reported in item 12.3.d).

#### 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.*

-

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

MS Access, MS Excel.

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

N/A

### 12.1.e Use of administrative data sources

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

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

Administrative data sources were used only to construct the frame. No administrative data sources were used to obtain data.

external registers:

- register of orchards, according to the act 597/2006 Coll. as amended by the act 467/2008 Coll. and Decree 15/2009 of MPRV SR (Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development of the Slovak Republic)
- register of vineyards, EU Regulations 479/2008 and 436/2009 (Commission Regulation (EC) No 436/2009 of 26 May 2009 laying down detailed rules for the application of Council Regulation (EC) No 479/2008 as regards the vineyard register)
- Farm animals central register (FACR) records (farms and facilities; owners and keepers; animals and events that concern them; transfers of animals; veterinary operations and controls) according to the act 39/2007 Coll. as amended by the act 342/2011 Coll. animals by species on the basis of separate Decrees:
  - register of cattle, Decree 20/2012
  - register of pigs, Decree 17/2012
  - register of sheep, Decree 18/2012
  - register of goats, Decree 18/2012
- register of organic farms, Act 189/2009 Coll. on organic agricultural production
- register of applicants of the Single Area Payment Scheme (SAPS), Regulation of the Government of SR 369/2012, file of applications submitted on 15-th May

Registers are updated continuously in the frame of every year

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

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

The definition of the reporting unit is equal to that used by the Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic.

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

Purpose	<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	N/A



- 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>	N/A
- to replace the survey on all characteristics and on a part of the survey population	N/A
- 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>	N/A
- to build/update the (sampling) frame (used for census or for sample survey)	external registers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• register of orchards</li> <li>• register of vineyards</li> <li>• register of cattle</li> <li>• register of pigs</li> <li>• register of sheep</li> <li>• register of goats</li> <li>• register of organic farms</li> <li>• register of applicants of the Single Area Payment Scheme (SAPS)</li> </ul>
- to pre-fill answers in the questionnaires which are then checked by farmers during the survey	N/A
- to impute item/unit non-response	N/A
- to validate the survey data (quality control). <i>Please indicate actions taken in case of large discrepancies</i>	N/A
- to calibrate of survey estimates. <i>Please indicate the calibration variables</i>	N/A
- other ( <i>please specify in the next column</i> )	N/A

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

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

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

- problems creating the links between databases caused by e.g. the lack of common identifiers, obstacles related

to IT issues etc.

### 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>	N/A
	<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>	N/A
	<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>	N/A
	<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>	N/A
	<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>	N/A
	<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>	N/A
	<b>- errors in register variables</b> (analogue to measurement errors in a survey) i.e. erroneous values for certain variables	N/A
	<b>- processing errors.</b> <i>Please provide an assessment. You can mention here imputation methods used, if any.</i>	N/A
	<b>- coherence</b> (comparison to other available data) of the administrative data (ex-ante and/or ex-post)	N/A

- **other drawbacks (if any)** of the use of data from the administrative source. *Please specify the drawbacks in the next column.*

N/A

[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 frequency of data collection is conditional of Regulation 1166/2008. Currently two times between FSC.

## 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.*

a/ internet - application allowing completing data electronically

b/ paper questionnaires

All reporting units were contacted by the paper questionnaire sent by post. The reporting units could choose form of the reply (Internet or by post). Via Internet answered 1598 reporting units.

### 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.

a/ entering data online by the farmer

b/ data from paper questionnaires were recorded at regional workplaces of the Statistical Office by hand typing

### 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.

Written reminders, call-back strategies, telephone reminders, training staff, giving priority to important farms

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.	<b>Number of holdings in the population covered by the records sent to Eurostat</b> Please note that the survey coverage of the records sent to Eurostat can be different from the national survey coverage in case very low (or no) national thresholds are applied. In case of a census <b>1=3+4+5</b>	23 566
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. <u>This item should be completed only in case of a sample survey, in which case 2=3+4+5</u>	17 471
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.	3 062
3.1	<b>Number of holdings with ceased activities</b> This item is a subset of 3. <b>3.1&gt;=3.1.1+3.1.2</b>	522
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.	-
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.	-
	<b>(new) Number of holdings with unknown eligibility status</b> The number of surveyed holdings which could	

4	<i>not be contacted (e.g. in a CATI survey) and for which it is not certain if they are eligible (e.g. in scope) or not.</i>	-
5	<b>(new) Number of eligible holdings</b> <i>The number of surveyed holdings which are eligible</i> $5=5.1+5.2$	14 409
5.1	<b>Number of non-responding holdings</b> <i>The number of eligible holdings which:</i> - were contacted but refused to take part in the survey; - were contacted but were unable to participate in the survey for various reasons; - participated in the survey but the entire survey form cannot be used because of poor quality etc. <i>This item refers to holdings for which no data is collected (unit non-response).</i> $5.1 \geq 5.1.1 + 5.1.2$	1 775
5.1.1	<b>Number of non-responding holdings – re-weighted</b>	1 343
5.1.2	<b>Number of non-responding holdings – imputed</b>	432
5.2	<b>Number of responding holdings</b> <i>This item includes holdings which provided completed questionnaires, either entirely or partially.</i>	12 634

**12.3.e Questionnaire(s)**

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

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

**Annexes:**

[FSS 2013 questionnaire Slovakia](#)

**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.*

Check on the completeness of the data, check the data format, check the range of the data, check the accuracy of the use of code lists

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

*Please mention tools used.*

Information System SOSR, which ensures the data recording

**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.*

- at the level of the local collection centre
- at the level of the central data processing

## 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 proposal of weights corresponds to the inverse probability of unit selection.

#### 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.*

To eliminate the non-response was used re-weighting. Re-weighting was made by standard weighing methods. Firstly, the rate of activity state of non-respondents was estimated. Estimation of the rate of activity in the same proportion as for responding units was set up. Estimation of the rate of activity at two strata was determined: region and LFA. Based on estimation of rate of activity by responding units size of the sampling frame was adjusted. The last step, new weights from the modified sampling frame corresponding to the reverse probabilities of unit selection was calculated.

#### 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.*

N/A

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

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

N/A

### 12.5.b Formulae applied for estimation methods

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

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

N/A

## 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.*



Negative impact on the 2013 production had extremely high temperatures without rainfall in the middle of the growing season in July and excessive rainfall and temperatures drop at the end of the growing season in September. Fluctuations in weather significantly affect crop production due to the low share of irrigated areas in the Slovak Republic.

### 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

## Related metadata

[Top](#)

## Annexes

[Top](#)