

ESA/STAT/2004/5  
April 2004  
English only

United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs  
Statistics Division, Demographic and Social Statistics Branch

---

## **United Nations *Demographic Yearbook* review**

**National reporting of economic characteristics data from population  
and housing censuses**

**Implications for international recommendations**

The Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat is a vital interface between global policies in the economic, social and environmental spheres and national action. The Department works in three main interlinked areas: (i) it compiles, generates and analyses a wide range of economic, social and environmental data and information on which States Members of the United Nations draw to review common problems and to take stock of policy options; (ii) it facilitates the negotiations of Member States in many intergovernmental bodies on joint courses of action to address ongoing or emerging global challenges; and (iii) it advises interested Governments on the ways and means of translating policy frameworks developed in United Nations conferences and summits into programmes at the country level and, through technical assistance, helps build national capacities.

#### NOTE

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this report do not imply the expression of any opinion on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country or territory or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures.

The term “country” as used in the text of this report also refers, as appropriate, to territories or areas.

This report has been issued without formal editing.

## Preface

### United Nations *Demographic Yearbook* review technical reports

The present report, on national reporting of economic characteristics data from population censuses, is one of a series of technical reports reviewing the United Nations *Demographic Yearbook* system. The system is designed to collect, store and disseminate official national demographic and social statistics at the international level, and provides a selection of these data to a wide range of users through print publications such as the annual *Demographic Yearbook*, as well as through CD ROM on special topics<sup>1</sup>, and the Internet<sup>2</sup>.

Earlier drafts of these technical reports served as input to the United Nations Expert Group Meeting to Review the *Demographic Yearbook* System<sup>3</sup>, which aimed to assess the continued relevance and responsiveness of the system to the emerging needs of a variety of users. The reports review the instruments used by the *Demographic Yearbook* system to collect data from national statistical offices in terms of how well they adhere to relevant international guidelines in terms of concepts, definitions and classifications used.

Furthermore, the technical reports review the response of countries to data requests by the *Demographic Yearbook* system for the period 1961 to 2000 (shorter period for some), and relate national practices with respect to classifications to relevant international recommendations for the topics being reported. The main international recommendations that are used in the assessment are, as appropriate, the *Principles and Recommendations for Population and Housing Censuses, Revision 1*<sup>4</sup>, the *Principles and Recommendations for a Vital Statistics System, Revision 2*<sup>5</sup>, and *Recommendations on Statistics of International Migration, Revision 1*<sup>6</sup>.

The reviews, as well as the discussion at the Expert Group Meeting, have highlighted a number of issues including the fact that the questionnaires for the *Demographic Yearbook* system need to be reviewed and revised to bring them in line with international guidelines in terms of concepts and classifications, and that the content of the disseminated tables needs to be reexamined. Furthermore, the review of reported data from previous censuses has pointed to the need for a review and revision of international recommendations.

---

<sup>1</sup> Two CD-ROMs have so far been issued: the *Demographic Yearbook Historical Supplement*, which presents demographic statistics for the period 1948 to 1997, and the *Demographic Yearbook: Natality Statistics*, which contains a series of detailed tables dedicated to natality and covering the period 1980 to 1998.

<sup>2</sup> For example, data on capital cities and cities with population of 100,000 or more are available at <http://www.un.org/depts/unsd/demog/index.html>; and, data from the *Population and Vital Statistics Report* are available to subscribers at <http://unstats.un.org/unsd/seriesa/index.asp>.

<sup>3</sup> Held in November 2003, in New York. Information on the Expert Group Meeting can be found on the website of the United Nations Statistics Division at [http://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic/workshop/EGM\\_dyb/index.htm](http://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic/workshop/EGM_dyb/index.htm).

<sup>4</sup> United Nations publication, Sales No. E.98.XVII.8.

<sup>5</sup> United Nations publication, Sales No. E.01.XVII.10.

<sup>6</sup> United Nations publication, Sales No. E.98.XVII.14.

At its thirty-fifth session, the United Nations Statistical Commission<sup>7</sup> recommended the formation of an Expert Group to consider critical issues related to planning the 2010 round of population and housing censuses, and to set plans for a world programme including use of common definitions, concepts, classifications, tabulations and dissemination mechanisms for population and housing censuses. This mandate requires a review and possible revision or supplementation of the current census recommendations, which were developed for the 2000 census round. These technical reports will contribute to that review. They also provide some indication of the capacity of countries and areas to report their national data to the *Demographic Yearbook* system.

---

<sup>7</sup> *Report on the thirty-fifth session (2-5 March 2004)*. Economic and Social Council, Official Records 2004, Supplement No. 4. E/2004/24: E/CN.3/2004/33. <http://unstats.un.org/unsd/statcom/doc04/report-submitted.pdf>; paragraph 2 (a).

## CONTENTS

**Executive summary 7**

**Introduction 10**

**I. The UNSD population census questionnaire on economic characteristics 12**

**A. Description of the UNSD questionnaire \_\_\_\_\_ 12**

**B. Comments on the questionnaire \_\_\_\_\_ 13**

**II. Overview of the dissemination by UNSD of statistics of economic characteristics 17**

**A. Dissemination by UNSD \_\_\_\_\_ 17**

**B. Comparison with statistics on economic activity disseminated by ILO \_\_\_\_\_ 18**

**III. Review of DYB tables on economic characteristics 21**

**A. Economically active population (EAP) \_\_\_\_\_ 22**

Overall response rate to table on EAP \_\_\_\_\_ 22

Availability of age-sex breakdown \_\_\_\_\_ 26

Age limits \_\_\_\_\_ 28

Availability of urban/rural data \_\_\_\_\_ 29

Timeliness \_\_\_\_\_ 30

Comparison with published ILO data \_\_\_\_\_ 32

Presentation of data \_\_\_\_\_ 32

**B. Population not economically active (NEA) by functional category \_\_\_\_\_ 33**

Response rate to table on NEA by age, sex and functional category \_\_\_\_\_ 33

Availability of age, sex and functional category breakdowns \_\_\_\_\_ 34

Availability of urban/rural data \_\_\_\_\_ 34

**C. EAP by industry, by occupation and by status in employment \_\_\_\_\_ 35**

Response rates to tables on EAP by industry, by occupation and by status in employment \_\_\_\_\_ 35

Regional differences in data availability \_\_\_\_\_ 37

Availability of age-sex breakdowns \_\_\_\_\_ 38

Availability of urban/rural data \_\_\_\_\_ 39

Employed population versus economically active population \_\_\_\_\_ 40

**D. Female economically active population by marital status \_\_\_\_\_ 41**

Response rate to the table on female EAP by marital status \_\_\_\_\_ 41

Availability of age-sex breakdowns \_\_\_\_\_ 42

**IV. Suggestions and points for discussion 43**

On data collection \_\_\_\_\_ 43

On dissemination \_\_\_\_\_ 46

Annex 1. List of tables reviewed 48

Annex 2. Years in which population censuses were conducted, by continent and country or area, for the 1970, 1980, 1990 and 2000 rounds of censuses, and whether their EAP data have been published in the DYB (up to the 1994 issue) 49

## Executive summary

The United Nations Statistics Division (UNSD) collects economic characteristics data from population censuses, and has done so for more than 50 years, using standardised questionnaires mailed out to national statistical offices (NSOs). The collected data are processed and disseminated by UNSD through its *Demographic Yearbook* (DYB) system.

The current report examines UNSD's population census questionnaire on economic characteristics and reviews reporting of national data on economic characteristics to UNSD.

### ***The need for updating and revising the UNSD census questionnaire on economic characteristics***

The report points to the need for thorough review and revision of the UNSD population census questionnaire on economic characteristics. Using as references the *Principles and Recommendations of Population and Housing Censuses, Rev. 1* and the latest international economic classifications in its review of the questionnaire on economic characteristics, the report identified several places requiring updating and revision. Some of the suggested updates have been adopted in 2002, but further changes may be necessary. For example, the questionnaire should give definitions of the economically active population, employed persons and unemployed persons. If definitions used by the country differ from the ones given, the questionnaire should provide instructions to respondents on what to do. Additional information important for understanding the data should be obtained from countries, such as the concept (currently active or usually active) and reference period (one day, one week, other) used by the country.

Revision of the UNSD population census questionnaire on economic characteristics should be done in consultation with the International Labour Office (ILO) for the mutual benefit of both organizations.

### *Improving country<sup>8</sup> or area coverage*

Country response to the economic characteristics questionnaire cannot be considered satisfactory. Less than 75 per cent of all countries provided any data on economic activity to UNSD in either the 1970 or 1980 rounds of population and housing censuses, and this deteriorated in the 1990 round to less than 60 per cent. Amongst these responding countries, the proportions that also provided data on the economically active population by industry, by occupation or by status in employment, or data on the not economically active population by functional category, ranged from roughly 60 to 80 per cent for the three census rounds. A much lower proportion of countries provided data on female economically active population by marital status.

The countries did pretty well as far as providing data by age and sex for all the tables that call for this breakdown. Roughly 90 per cent of countries that provided data were able to provide data by age and sex. Breakdown by urban/rural, however, is a completely different situation, with only slightly more than 20 per cent of reporting countries reporting this breakdown.

UNSD needs to exert more effort towards improving response rate to its questionnaire on economic characteristics. UNSD should be more proactive in acquiring data from countries by contacting respondents, obtaining census publications, and making use of websites of NSOs. UNSD should also improve its data sharing arrangements with ILO, as there are benefits to be derived for both organizations, not to mention the reduction of response burden on countries.

The low response rate from the 1990 round is striking. It is suggested that UNSD collect data from the 1990 round at the same time that it sends out the questionnaire for the 2000 round, if no response had previously been obtained from the 1990 census round.

---

<sup>8</sup> The term “country” as used in the text of this report also refers, as appropriate, to territories or areas.



### ***Data dissemination***

For disseminated tables to be more useful, UNSD might consider presenting rates, percentages and percentage distributions, to be calculated by UNSD or provided by the country. Introduction of any of these additional items will, of course, have to be weighed carefully for relevance, technical merit and implementability.

The tables on economic characteristics contain an enormous amount of data. Given the current state of information technology, it is no longer sufficient to disseminate the data solely in print form. To increase utilization of the data provided conscientiously by countries, UNSD needs to make them accessible to users in a much more manipulable format than the print DYB. Dissemination in a database or similarly convenient format will have to happen soon.

## Introduction

1. The United Nations Statistics Division (UNSD) has the responsibility of collecting and disseminating official national population and vital statistics at the international level. For data collection, UNSD relies mainly on questionnaires sent to and returned by national statistical offices around the world. These questionnaires request statistics on a wide range of demographic and social topics, the primary sources of which are the population census and administrative records (for vital statistics and border statistics).
2. The official statistics reported by national statistical offices (NSOs) in response to the UNSD questionnaires are then processed and disseminated by UNSD. The primary medium for dissemination of these international demographic and social statistics is the *Demographic Yearbook* (DYB).
3. Beginning with its second issue, the DYB has featured a recurring special topic every year, for example mortality, natality, international migration and population censuses, among others. From 1948 to 1996, the yearbook published general tables and special topic tables in the same volume. The only two exceptions are the 1978 and 1991 issues, when the DYB was issued in two parts: a general tables volume and a special topic volume. From the 1997 issue onwards, the print DYB being disseminated annually contains only the general tables. Two supplementary (special topic) volumes have been issued since, a historical supplement in 1997 and a natality special topic in 2000.
4. The current report focuses on statistics on *economic characteristics* collected by UNSD and disseminated in the DYB special topic issues on population censuses. The report consists of four parts. Part I examines UNSD's 2001 population census questionnaire on economic characteristics; part II gives an overview of the dissemination by UNSD of statistics on economic characteristics from population

censuses; part III reviews data availability in the DYB tables on economic characteristics covering the period 1965 to 1994; and part IV offers suggestions and points for discussion.

Parts I and II of the present report were prepared in 2002, and represent the situation as of August 2002. Since then, based on the suggestions in part I, some changes have been introduced in the UNSD population census questionnaire on economic characteristics. These changes are flagged by a footnote.

## I. The UNSD population census questionnaire on economic characteristics

### A. Description of the UNSD questionnaire

5. The UNSD population census questionnaire on *economic characteristics* is one of six sets of questionnaires mailed out to more than 200 countries or areas (215 in the year 2001) in September or October<sup>9</sup>. At present, the UNSD questionnaire on economic characteristics consists of the following nine tables:

Table 1. Population by type of activity, age and sex

Table 2. Population not economically active by functional category, age and sex

Table 3. Economically active population by industry, age and sex

Table 4. Economically active population by occupation, age and sex

Table 4A. Economically active foreign-born population by occupation, age and sex

Table 5. Economically active population by status, age and sex

Table 6. Economically active population by status, industry and sex

Table 7. Economically active population by status, occupation and sex

Table 8. Female population by type of activity, age and marital status

In all tabulations except tables 4 and 4A, there is a note to the respondent to provide similar tabulations by urban/rural residence, if possible, on separate sheets of paper.

6. The questionnaire on economic characteristics was developed in the 1970s, after the issuance of *The Principles and Recommendations for the 1970 Population Censuses* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.67.XVII.3, hereafter referred to as 1970 recommendations). The tables in the economic characteristics questionnaire are in agreement with the 1970 recommendations and include all of the seven tabulations

---

<sup>9</sup> The six sets of questionnaires are: the questionnaire on population estimates, the questionnaire on vital statistics, the questionnaire on international migration and travel statistics, the population census questionnaire (general), the population census questionnaire on household characteristics and the population census questionnaire on economic characteristics. The first three questionnaires are mailed out annually, while the last three are sent to a country or area only when it is known that it has completed a population census.

recommended therein as first priority and one of three recommended as second priority. A ninth table, which was most likely added later, collects data on a subset of the population, namely the foreign-born.

## **B. Comments on the questionnaire**

7. The 2001 questionnaire on economic characteristics was reviewed for consistency with the *Principles and Recommendations for Population and Housing Censuses, Revision 1* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.98.XVII.8, hereafter referred to as the 1998 recommendations). Based on the review, several points for improvement or consideration are offered below. As noted, some of the suggested changes have been adopted in the 2002 questionnaire, following an earlier version of the present report.
  
8. The economic characteristics questionnaire does not currently provide the respondent with the internationally agreed definition of economic activity (i.e., the current ILO definition, which uses the concept of economic production established in the System of National Accounts) nor does it ask the definition used by countries in identifying the economically active, employed and unemployed populations. Moreover, it does not ask for information on the concept (current activity, usual activity) or the reference period used by countries in identifying economic activity. Information on definitions, concept and reference period used by a country to identify its economically active population is necessary for assessing levels of activity observed and when making international comparisons. In the revised questionnaire, these omissions should be remedied. UNSD would do well to collect and disseminate the above-mentioned metadata with the tables. Coordination with the International Labour Office (ILO) would be very useful given the work that they have done and are doing in this area.<sup>10</sup> UNSD should continue its current practice of asking

---

<sup>10</sup> ILO published in 1996 Sources and Methods: Labour Statistics, vol. 5, Total and Economically Active Population, Employment and Unemployment (population censuses). The publication described national practices in the collection of statistics on total and economically active population, employment and unemployment derived from population

countries about groups included or excluded from the economically active and not economically active populations.

9. The classifications used in the current UNSD questionnaire are the ISIC rev. 2 and the 1968 ISCO. These should be updated to ISIC rev 3 and ISCO-88, respectively.<sup>11</sup> However, allowance should be made for countries that have not adopted the new classifications, perhaps by providing both versions of classifications in the questionnaire. It would be helpful to find out ILO's format for requesting data using two alternative versions of ISIC and ISCO, and their experience with its use in countries. It should be pointed out here that while ISIC rev. 2 had only 10 major divisions, ISIC rev. 3 has 18 major categories (A to Q; X).
10. For both industry and occupation, the UNSD questionnaire requested only data by major group or major division (first level). The collection and dissemination of data beyond the first level deserves consideration during the questionnaire review and revision, given increased user needs and the possibility of data collection via electronic means. Should UNSD consider this suggestion, coordination with ILO is important given their past and current work in this area; for example, their compilation of detailed data on occupation (SEGREGAT database).
11. For classifying status in employment, ICSE-1993 has replaced ICSE-1958. The categories did not change between the two classifications, but ICSE-1993 defined and elaborated more precisely the different categories of workers. The category "unpaid family workers" is referred to as "contributing family workers" in the ICSE-1993. The new UNSD questionnaire should reflect the new classification, and continue to collect data on employers and own account workers separately<sup>12</sup>. The category "own-account workers" provide important information in studying the informal sector.

---

censuses carried out during the period 1989-1994 in 115 countries or areas. ILO is currently working on a third edition that will cover the period 1995-2004.

<sup>11</sup> This change was implemented in the electronic questionnaires mailed out in 2002.

<sup>12</sup> The change in terminology was implemented in the questionnaires mailed out in 2002.

12. The other classifications used in the UNSD questionnaire on economic characteristics (e.g., type of activity, functional categories) did not change between the 1970 and 1998 recommendations. However, there are some terminology changes. The UNSD questionnaire ought to adopt the new terminology, for example, changing “type of activity” to “usual (or current) activity status”; “status” to “status in employment”; and “unpaid family workers” to “contributing family workers”.<sup>13</sup>
13. The suggested age groupings for economic characteristics tables are the same for the 1970 and the 1998 recommendations, having 75+ as the final age group, with exception of the marital status table (table 8) where the 1970 recommendations had 65+ as the final age group. The UNSD questionnaire nevertheless used 75+ for this table. Other tables in the questionnaire also used 75+ as the final age group, except tables 3 and 4, which had 70+ as the final age category. This should be revised in the future questionnaire, so that all tables have 75+ as the final category.<sup>14</sup>
14. The footnote in the UNSD questionnaire (tables 1-5 and table 8) about minimum age is not clear. It can be reworded to follow language in the illustrative tables of the 1998 recommendations. Better still, the country could be asked to specify the minimum age it adopted for enumerating the economically active population. UNSD needs to discuss what to do about countries that use a minimum age lower than 10. It is suggested that the questionnaire provide space for a possible 6-9, 7-9 or some other age group (to be filled in by respondents according to the lowest age used in their census for economic characteristics questions) in addition to the group 10-14, rather than allowing only one category “under 15” as in the current questionnaire. This adjustment would provide data to study child labour at the youngest ages.

---

<sup>13</sup> This was partially implemented in the questionnaires mailed out in 2002.

<sup>14</sup> This change was implemented in the electronic questionnaires mailed out in 2002.

15. Table 8 of the UNSD questionnaire should be collected for both male and female populations in the future, following the 1998 recommendations.<sup>15</sup>
  
16. The 1998 census recommendations listed 24 tabulations dealing with economic characteristics (pp.180-203), compared to only 10 in the 1970 recommendations. New variables in the 1998 recommendations include place of work, institutional sector of employment, educational attainment, number of hours worked, monthly or annual income and primary reason for inactivity. The 1998 recommendations also added tabulations on households to provide information on the economic situation of households. The variables for households include annual income, size of household, number of usually (or currently) active members, number of usually (or currently) unemployed members and number of dependent children under age 15.
  
17. Many of the tabulations in the 1998 recommendations represent multi-dimensional tabulations involving both new and existing variables. Given the increased demand by users for more detailed statistics, UNSD should review the new recommendations with a view to expanding its collection and dissemination of economic characteristics data from population censuses. However, any expansion should be approached with caution, considering the additional reporting burden on countries and the ability of countries to produce tables with additional dimensions.

---

<sup>15</sup> This change was implemented in the electronic questionnaires mailed out in 2002.



## II. Overview of the dissemination by UNSD of statistics of economic characteristics

### A. Dissemination by UNSD

18. To date, UNSD's dissemination of statistics on economic characteristics has been limited to the print DYB. Specifically, 14 issues of the DYB have featured the special topic *Population Census Statistics*. Of these, eight contained Economic Characteristics tables: the 1956, 1964, 1972, 1973, 1979, 1984, 1988 and 1994 issues.
19. The first three of these issues presented only total (no urban/rural), but beginning in 1973, urban/rural data were presented for all tables in addition to the total.
20. The DYB published a total of eight tables on economic characteristics in the 1964, 1972, 1973, 1979 and 1988 issues, and nine tables in the 1984 and 1994 issues (see annex 1). The ninth table is the one on economically active foreign-born population by occupation, age and sex. The 1984 issue was not the first to include this table. It first appeared in the 1977 issue, which had international migration as its special topic, although at that time the table was not cross-classified by age. To have a wide reach, it is suggested that in the future the table on economically active foreign-born population by occupation, age and sex be published in both the special topic issue on international migration as was done in 1977, and the special topic issue on censuses (economic characteristics) as was done in 1984 and 1994.
21. The format of seven out of the nine published tables on economic characteristics followed closely that of the UNSD population census questionnaire on economic characteristics. The two published tables that deviate from the questionnaire tabulations are those derived from tables 1 and 8 of the questionnaire, both of which ask for population by type of activity. The data on the numbers employed and unemployed obtained from the questionnaire were not disseminated. Only the total

and economically active populations and the activity rate (calculated by UNSD) by age and sex are published from the information obtained in table 1 of the questionnaire; and female economically active population by marital status and age from table 8. This is presumably because of concerns about the quality or limitations of employment and unemployment data derived from censuses. The continuance of collecting but not disseminating employment/unemployment data needs rethinking.

22. All of the modifications that UNSD eventually introduces in the economic characteristics questionnaire (see part I) has implications for data dissemination and should be accordingly reflected in the disseminated tables where relevant. As mentioned in paragraph 17, there is a critical need to review and consider what statistics on economic characteristics the UNSD should collect and disseminate. For existing tables, the review process could include examining how well countries have responded (the subject of part III of this report). For proposed new tables, UNSD can evaluate national capacity to respond by internally examining recent national census reports for the extent to which such tables are already being produced and disseminated by countries.
23. Users often find it easier to make comparisons if the data are also given in summary form as rates, percentages or percentage distributions. When table formats for dissemination are reviewed, this might be an issue to consider.
24. The economic characteristics tables have so far been disseminated only in print form through the DYB. The amount of data contained in these tables make it very difficult for users to utilize unless data are made available in formats that they can manipulate and perform calculations and analyses on. For DYB to be widely utilized, UNSD must make the data available to users in a format that they can easily access, manipulate and work with.

## **B. Comparison with statistics on economic activity disseminated by ILO**

25. The ILO collects and disseminates data on economic activity, including those derived from population censuses. Up to 1995, ILO's Yearbook of Labour Statistics (YLS) included the following four tables on the economically active population:

Table 1. Total and economically active population by age group and sex

Table 2A. Economically active population by industry and status in employment

Table 2B. Economically active population by occupation and status in employment

Table 2C. Economically active population by industry and occupation

26. Statistics for the above four tables of the YLS have generally been drawn from the latest population censuses or sample surveys. However, most of the data presented in these tables are derived from surveys. Up to 1995, the classifications used in the YLS are mainly the ISIC rev. 2 and ISCO-68, just like in the DYB. The YLS also presents statistics on employment, unemployment, hours of work, etc. but none of these are based on population census data.

27. Beginning in 1996, ILO reduced their tables on the economically active in the YLS to two: the old table 1, now called table 1A, and table 1B, economically active population by level of education, age group and sex. At present, these are the only two tables in the ILO publication that use census data, although it should be pointed out that most of the data presented in these two tables are, as before, from surveys. The source (census, LFSS, etc.) is clearly indicated beside the country name in each table.

28. It appears then that the overlap in the dissemination of statistics on economic characteristics between UNSD and ILO has been reduced beginning in 1996 to one table, namely total and economically active population and economic activity rates, by age and sex (1994 DYB table 26 and 2001 YLS table 1). The difference is that the DYB table relies exclusively on census data whereas the YLS table uses censuses, surveys and official national estimates. In addition, the DYB publishes this table roughly every five to ten years, whereas the YLS publishes it every year.

29. The overlap in the collection of data is wider. Both UNSD and ILO collect data on economically active population by industry; by occupation; by status in employment; by industry and status in employment; and by occupation and status in employment. These statistics are no longer published in the YLS, and are not available from the ILO website. but ILO continues to request these data from countries for inclusion in their LABORSTA database. There is room for discussion on data sharing between UNSD and ILO of economic characteristics data that derive from censuses.

### III. Review of DYB tables on economic characteristics

30. Part I of this report reviewed the Population Census Questionnaire on Economic Characteristics that UNSD uses to collect data on economic characteristics from countries or areas, vis-a-vis the *Principles and Recommendations for Population and Housing Censuses*, Rev. 1. Part II gave an overview of the dissemination of economic characteristics data by UNSD, and includes a comparison of the types of statistics that UNSD disseminated in its DYB with those that the ILO disseminates in its Yearbook of Labour Statistics. Points for consideration were interspersed in the review.
31. This part of the report looks at country response to each of the eight statistical tables (see list in annex 1) published in the DYB under the special topic economic characteristics (a ninth table, economically active foreign-born population by occupation, age and sex, is not included in this review). It describes and analyzes the extent of completeness of data for these tables, based on reporting by countries, and covers the period 1965 through 1994.
32. To date, eight print DYB issues have featured economic characteristics as their special topic: 1956, 1964, 1972, 1973, 1979, 1984, 1988 and 1994. This review focuses on the 1970, 1980 and 1990 census rounds; hence, it looked at the last six of these yearbooks, from 1972 to 1994. To complete the analysis, the review also looked at the Demographic Statistics Database, selected ILO publications and a number of national census publications.
33. Responses from the 2000 round of censuses have only started to come in. These statistics have not yet been disseminated by UNSD, but a brief analysis showing response rates for the table on population by economic activity is included in this part of the report for the 2000 round.

## A. Economically active population (EAP)

### *Overall response rate to table on EAP*

34. The most basic of the economic characteristics tables derived from national population censuses and published in the DYB is the “economically active population (EAP) and activity rates by sex, age and urban/rural residence” (table 26 in the 1994 Demographic Yearbook). This table has the highest response rate of the eight tables reviewed. Yet, the response rate as reflected in what is published in the DYB cannot be considered high. Only 64 per cent of the 203 countries in the 1970 round and 71 per cent in the 1980 round reported any data to the DYB on the EAP in time for publication. The percentage is much lower for the 1990 round—only 42 per cent of the then 224 countries or areas had any EAP data in the DYB (table 1).

Table 1. Percentage of countries or areas for which any data on economically active population are published in the DYB (up to the 1994 issue), by region, 1970, 1980 and 1990 census rounds\*

Region	1965-1974	1975-1984	1985-1994	
			DYB only	DYB+ database**
Africa	44	49	38	55
North America	77	83	39	53
South America	71	79	50	79
Asia	52	71	38	48
Europe	84	82	59	70
Oceania	79	79	32	50
Total	64	71	42	57

\* Figures shown are percentages, with the total number of countries or areas in the corresponding region as denominator. For this denominator and actual numbers of countries or areas for which data are available, see table 3. \*\*Includes as yet unpublished data available in the database as of July 2003.

35. The low percentage of countries reporting for the 1990 round as reflected in the last two published DYB issues (1988 and 1994) is due in part to the unavailability of the results of some censuses conducted in the 1990 round at the time of preparation of the 1988 and 1994 DYB, given that processing of data on population characteristics

takes a relatively long time in many countries. Supplementing what was published in the DYB with information from the Demographic Statistics Database (as of July 2003) showed an improvement in the response rate, to 57 per cent. This, however, is still lower than the earlier rounds. Reasons for this low response should be identified.

36. Over the three census rounds, it appears that there was a slight improvement in the 1980 census round over 1970 round (71% versus 64%), but the situation regressed in the 1990 round, with the overall level of response rate falling below that of the 1970 round, to 57 per cent.
37. The response rates were uneven among regions, with North America, South America, Europe and Oceania showing over 70 per cent response rates in both the 1970 and 1980 census rounds (table 1). The response rate was lowest for Africa, where less than 50 per cent of countries reported any data on the numbers economically active in both the 1970 and 1980 census rounds. Asia fell in between, with 52 per cent of countries reporting in the 1970 round and 71 per cent in the 1980 round.
38. For the 1990 round, considering the figures supplemented by the Demographic Database, it appears that the response rate for Africa (55%) is an improvement over the 1980 round, and for South America was the same as that of the 1980 round (79%). For the rest of the regions, response rates for the 1990 round fell well short of those for the 1980 round (table 1). All in all, over the three census rounds, Africa showed a slow but steady improvement in response rate and South America had a slight improvement from the 1970 round to the 1980 round, then remained at the same level in the 1990 round. The other four regions, after having been either flat (Europe, Oceania) or improved (sharply in the case of Asia, modestly in North America) between the 1970 and 1980 rounds, regressed in the 1990 round. This strange result needs investigation by UNSD.
39. The results of the 2000 round of censuses are already available for many countries, but economic activity data are not necessarily available for all of them because some

countries give a lower priority to the processing and dissemination of such data compared to population data. For other countries, a census has not been conducted yet in the 2000 round. These factors are reflected in the relatively small number of countries responding thus far to the UNSD economic characteristics questionnaire.

40. For the 2000 round of censuses, data on population by economic activity (table 1 of the economic characteristics questionnaire) are available in the DYB collection for only 45 countries or areas so far, a response rate of 20 per cent (table 2). Of the six regions, Asia has the highest response rate (34%).

Table 2. Number and percentage of countries or areas that have reported any data on economically active population (EAP) to UNSD, by region, for the 2000 census round\*

Region	1995-2003		
	No. of countries or areas	Provided data on EAP	
		No.	%
Africa	56	9	<b>16</b>
North America	36	6	<b>17</b>
South America	14	3	<b>21</b>
Asia	50	17	<b>34</b>
Europe	46	6	<b>13</b>
Oceania	22	4	<b>18</b>
Total	224	45	<b>20</b>

\* Number and percentage of countries that have provided data, whether or not with age-sex breakdown, as at 15 July 2003.

41. Country response varied from “complete”, that is, supplying economic activity data by age and sex for every census, to “none”, that is, supplying no data for all three census rounds even when there was at least one population census conducted in the 30-year period under review. Most countries supplied data from two or three censuses during the 30-year period under review, with African countries showing the lowest response frequency and certainly the highest non-response. (See annex 2 for a list of population censuses conducted from the 1970 to 2000 census round, by region and country, and an indication of whether data on the economically active population from those censuses have been published in the DYB.)



Table 3. Number of countries or areas for which data on economically active population (EAP) and EAP by age and sex have been reported in the DYB (up to the 1994 issue), by region, for the 1970, 1980 and 1990 census rounds and the three decade rounds combined

Region		Number of countries or areas			
		1965-1974	1975-1984	1985-1994	Three decades
Africa					
	Total number of countries or areas	55	55	56	56
	Conducted a population census	38	49	46	55
	With EAP data in DYB	24	27	21	40
	With EAP data by age and sex in DYB	16	23	18	33
North America					
	Total number of countries or areas	35	36	36	36
	Conducted a population census	35	32	31	36
	With EAP data in DYB	27	30	14	35
	With EAP data by age and sex in DYB	23	28	14	35
South America					
	Total number of countries or areas	14	14	14	14
	Conducted a population census	12	13	13	14
	With EAP data in DYB	10	11	7	13
	With EAP data by age and sex in DYB	9	11	7	13
Asia					
	Total number of countries or areas	42	42	50	50
	Conducted a population census	30	33	42	49
	With EAP data in DYB	22	30	19	33
	With EAP data by age and sex in DYB	20	28	18	32
Europe					
	Total number of countries or areas	38	38	46	46
	Conducted a population census	34	34	42	46
	With EAP data in DYB	32	31	27	37
	With EAP data by age and sex in DYB	28	28	26	35
Oceania					
	Total number of countries or areas	19	19	22	22
	Conducted a population census	18	19	22	22
	With EAP data in DYB	15	15	7	17
	With EAP data by age and sex in DYB	12	15	7	16
Total					
	Total number of countries or areas	203	204	224	224
	Conducted a population census	167	180	196	222
	With EAP data in DYB	130	144	95	175
	With EAP data by age and sex in DYB	108	133	90	164

42. It should be noted that a factor contributing to the low response rates is the fact that population censuses were not conducted in a number of countries in certain decades. Another reason is the low priority given to the processing and dissemination of social and economic characteristics data from censuses. Notwithstanding the above reasons, non-transmittal of available data by countries to UNSD is still a problem and an issue of concern.
43. Not counting the new States that emerged after 1990 (mostly in Europe, Asia and Oceania), as many as 33 countries or areas had no EAP data at all in the DYB, for the 30-year period 1965 to 1994 (table 4). All but one of these countries have conducted at least one census during the period.

Table 4. Countries or areas\* with no published data on economic activity in the DYB (up to the 1994 issue) from 1965 to 1994

Africa (16)	Burkina Faso, Chad, Dem. Rep. of the Congo, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Guinea, Kenya, Madagascar, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Uganda
North America (1)	Dominican Republic
South America (1)	Suriname
Asia (10)	Cambodia, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Lao People's Democratic Rep., Lebanon**, Mongolia, Myanmar, Occupied Palestinian Territory, Oman, Saudi Arabia
Europe (4)	Albania, Andorra, Iceland, Netherlands
Oceania (1)	Tuvalu

\* Unless otherwise stated, the country or area has conducted at least one population census between 1965 and 1994.

\*\* There was no record of a population census conducted in Lebanon after 1965.

#### *Availability of age-sex breakdown*

44. Most of the countries or areas that provided data on economically active population were able to provide data by age and sex for at least one census (table 3). The good news is that the number of countries or areas that were able to provide EAP data but

unable to provide them by age and sex has decreased over the years. In all, 22 of the 130 countries that provided EAP data were not able to give age-sex breakdowns in the 1970 round; this was reduced to 11 of 144 countries in 1980 round; and further to five of 90 countries in the 1990 round. Translated into percentages, the numbers are 17, 8 and 6 per cent, respectively, for the three census rounds. Notably, in the 1990 round, all of the 14 countries or areas in North America that reported EAP data were able to provide age-sex breakdown, likewise all seven countries in South America and all seven countries or areas in Oceania. Since there were only a few countries or areas not providing data by age and/or sex, they will be enumerated below.

45. In Africa, eight of the 24 countries that provided economically active population data were unable to provide sex and/or age breakdown in the 1970 round; however, four of them (Botswana, Burundi, Cape Verde, St. Helena) showed progress by providing age-sex breakdown in their next census(es). The remaining four either did not report any subsequent census results (Lesotho), conducted no census up to 1994 (Libya, Western Sahara) or continued to show no age breakdown in the next census (Ghana). In the 1980 round, 4 countries (Central African Republic, Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana and Senegal) provided no age breakdown (but had sex breakdown). Cote d'Ivoire provided age-sex breakdown in its next census (1988) results; Central African Republic and Senegal did not report their next census (1988) results to the DYB; while Ghana did not conduct a census in the 1990 round. The 1990 round saw only two countries (Comoros and Mauritania) with no age breakdown and one (Rwanda) with neither sex nor age breakdown, although Rwanda and Comoros have both reported age-sex breakdown in a previous census.

46. In North America, six countries or areas (Bermuda, Cayman Islands, Jamaica, Panama, St. Kitts and Nevis, US Virgin Islands) did not report age breakdown for economic activity in one census but all of them reported age-sex breakdown either in an earlier or later census. In South America, only Falkland Islands did not report age-sex breakdowns (in two of the censuses they reported on).

47. Asia did well as far as providing the age-sex breakdown. India provided the breakdowns in earlier years but not in 1991; United Arab Emirates (1968) and Viet Nam (1979) provided no age breakdown in one census but did so in the following one. Yemen Arab Republic in 1975 and Democratic Republic of Yemen in 1973 both provided only sex breakdown for EAP, and those census years were their only EAP data submissions to UNSD.
48. In Europe, the problem of no age-sex breakdown for EAP occurred only for the USSR (1970 and 1979) and three of its component republics (Belarus, Ukraine and Lithuania, 1989). It should be noted, however, that age-sex breakdowns for EAP for these countries and years were published in the ILO Yearbook Retrospective Edition on Population Censuses (see para. 57).
49. In Oceania, three countries that reported EAP data gave no age-sex breakdowns in the 1970 round, but in the subsequent two rounds all countries or areas that reported EAP data provided age-sex breakdowns.

#### *Age limits*

50. The DYB publishes the lower age limit of the economically active population tabulations, and this is a good practice. This age is presumably the lowest age for which economic activity questions are asked in the population census. From the published table, it is apparent that this age varies considerably among countries, with the lowest age concentrated in African countries, where persons as young as 6 years old were asked the economic activity questions (e.g., in the Central African Republic, Cote d'Ivoire, Egypt, Mali). In contrast, in Europe and other developed countries, the lowest age for which economic activity questions were asked in the census is typically 15 or 16. Country variation in age limits has implications for data presentation and comparability.

51. The table “population by type of activity, age and sex” requested by the UNSD questionnaire is the basis for the published table, “economically active population and activity rates by sex, age and urban/rural residence”. The questionnaire requests data for the following age groups: under 15, 15-19, succeeding five year-age groups through 70-74, and 75+. While many countries or areas did report data by age, slightly less than half of them reported to the age group 75+ (or beyond), and this is true in all three decades (48, 49 and 47%). There was no consistency about countries’ last age group across the three census rounds. A country that reported to age 75+ in a year did not necessarily continue doing so in the next censuses; in fact, in many cases it regressed by reporting only to 65+ or 70+. Among regions, Africa had the highest percentage of countries (75%) reporting to age 75+, of those providing age-sex data in the 1970 round. Unfortunately, this percentage dropped to 52 per cent in the 1980 round and further to 39 per cent in the 1990 round. Only Europe and Oceania had more than half of their age-reporting countries or areas providing age data up to 75+ in 1990 round (table 5).

Table 5. Number and percentage of countries or areas providing data on economically active population by age-sex up to the age group 75+

Region	1965-1974		1975-1984		1985-1994	
	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*
Africa	12	<b>75</b>	12	<b>52</b>	7	<b>39</b>
North America	13	<b>57</b>	12	<b>43</b>	5	<b>36</b>
South America	4	<b>44</b>	6	<b>55</b>	3	<b>43</b>
Asia	5	<b>25</b>	5	<b>18</b>	6	<b>33</b>
Europe	14	<b>50</b>	24	<b>86</b>	17	<b>65</b>
Oceania	4	<b>33</b>	6	<b>40</b>	4	<b>57</b>
Total	52	<b>48</b>	65	<b>49</b>	42	<b>47</b>

\*The denominator is the number of countries or areas providing EAP data by age and sex, shown in table 3.

#### *Availability of urban/rural data*

52. Few countries were able to provide urban/rural data on economically active population by age and sex. Of those countries or areas that reported data on

economically active population by age-sex, only 19 per cent in the 1970 round, 26 per cent in the 1980 round and 24 per cent in the 1990 round also reported age-sex data by urban/rural (table 5).

53. In the 1970 round, the proportion of countries that reported age-sex data by urban/rural ranged from 45 per cent in Asia to none in Oceania. In the next two periods, Asia continued to have the best urban/rural reporting. In the 1990 round, one in three Asian countries with age-sex data reported age-sex urban/rural data as well. The proportions reporting urban/rural breakdowns were lowest in Africa and Oceania (table 6).

Table 6. Number and percentage of countries or areas providing urban/rural data on economically active population by age and sex

Region	1965-1974			1975-1984			1985-1994		
	With age-sex data	Has U/R data		With age-sex data	Has U/R data		With age-sex data	Has U/R data	
		No.	%		No.	%		No.	%
Africa	16	2	<b>13</b>	23	4	<b>17</b>	18	3	<b>17</b>
North America	23	5	<b>22</b>	28	5	<b>18</b>	14	4	<b>29</b>
South America	9	1	<b>11</b>	11	4	<b>36</b>	7	2	<b>29</b>
Asia	20	9	<b>45</b>	28	10	<b>36</b>	18	6	<b>33</b>
Europe	28	4	<b>14</b>	28	9	<b>32</b>	26	6	<b>23</b>
Oceania	12	0	<b>0</b>	15	2	<b>13</b>	7	1	<b>14</b>
Total	108	21	<b>19</b>	133	34	<b>26</b>	90	22	<b>24</b>

\* The percentages are calculated against the number of countries or areas providing EAP data by age and sex, also shown in the table.

### *Timeliness*

54. The time lag between the fielding of a census and the publication of its results on economically active population in the print DYB varies considerably among countries. Ideally, countries that conducted a census between 1985 and 1993 would have their data on EAP published in the 1994 DYB. Indeed, some countries or areas already have their 1992 economically active population by age and sex in the 1994 DYB (Benin, Zimbabwe, Netherlands Antilles, Bolivia, Colombia) and many more

have their 1990 and 1991 results in the publication. However, as many as 20 countries or areas that conducted a population census in 1991 or earlier did not make it to the 1994 DYB, although they did report to the DYB as evidenced by the presence of their data in the UNSD Demographic Databases. Two possible reasons are that these countries' data (a) were received too late for inclusion in the 1994 DYB or (b) had problems that were not resolved in time for inclusion in the 1994 DYB.

55. Timeliness has often been a problem; for example, 1973 data for Colombia and 1974 data for Congo, Liberia and five other countries or areas did not make it to the 1979 DYB but appeared in the 1984 issue. Similarly, 1983 data for the Sudan and 1984 data for Ethiopia and the Democratic Republic of the Congo did not make it to the 1988 DYB; unfortunately, these data were also not published in the subsequent issue (1994) because they fell outside of that issue's covered period (censuses from 1985 to 1994).

56. For economic characteristics tables, the 1973 DYB covered census results from 1965 to 1973; the 1979 DYB, from 1970 to 1979; the 1984 DYB, from 1974 to 1984; the 1988 DYB, from 1980 to 1988; and the 1994 DYB, from 1985 to 1994. This means that if the results of a census conducted in 1969 (or earlier) was not reported by the country in time to be included in the 1973 issue it was excluded in the subsequent issues; likewise, a 1973 (or earlier) census that did not make it to the 1979 issue had no chance of being published in the next DYB; similarly for a 1979 or earlier census that did not make it to the 1984 issue; or a 1984 or earlier census that did not make it to the 1988 issue. In short, countries that took longer than four years to submit their census results to the DYB ran the risk of not being included in any DYB publication, depending on the cycle that DYB used at the time. It appears that the window for inclusion in DYB has narrowed over the years, from 6 years in the early 1970s to five years in the late 1970s to four years in the early 1980s. In light of this, UNSD should review the appropriateness of their publication cycle, as well as the period covered within each publication.

### *Comparison with published ILO data*

57. A comparison of data available in the six DYB issues with those in the ILO Yearbook of Labour Statistics, Retrospective Edition on Population Censuses 1945-1989, yields some results that are worth noting. For the 1970 census round, we can potentially add 17 countries or areas from the ILO Yearbook to our existing 130 countries, and add age-sex breakdowns for Ghana, Libya and Guam; for the 1980 round, an additional 21 countries, of which 12 are African, and age-sex breakdowns for our Central African Republic, Belarus, Ukraine and USSR data; and for the 1985-89 period, 4 additional countries.
58. On the other hand, ILO could also benefit from using the DYB, since the DYB has quite a bit of data that are not in their retrospective edition. These discrepancies call into question the efficacy and extent of data sharing and coordination that has existed between UNSD and ILO.

### *Presentation of data*

59. The definition or concept of “economically active” as it appears in the past DYB issues is not adequately defined. There is no information in the DYB on the definition (SNA, other), concept (currently active or usually active), and reference period (one day, one week, other) used for EAP. Such metadata are very important to researchers and other data users. This should be remedied in both the collection and dissemination of economic characteristics data.
60. It is satisfying to see some exclusions to the population reported as economically active indicated in footnotes to the table. According to the footnotes, in some instances, the EAP reported in the DYB refers to “employed workers only” (for example, Liberia 1974); in others, the reported EAP excludes those seeking work for the first time (for example, Bulgaria 1975, Norway 1980, UK 1981); in one case, it excluded those seeking work for the first time and part-time workers (Nepal, 1981).



These notes are very important. However, to report employed workers in tables on the “economically active” is a serious deviation, and UNSD should consider a more visible flag or possibly a different approach for presenting them.

## **B. Population not economically active (NEA) by functional category**

### *Response rate to table on NEA by age, sex and functional category*

61. The level of reporting of data to UNSD on population not economically active (NEA) by functional category was much lower than that for the economically active population (EAP). This is to be expected, since the economically active population is the most basic among the economic characteristics data collected by countries. Thus, while as many as 130, 144 and 95 countries or areas, respectively, had economically active population data from the 1970, 1980 and 1990 census rounds published in the DYB, the corresponding numbers for non-economically active population by functional category were 94, 112 and 59 (table 7). As in the case of the EAP table, there seems to be better reporting in the 1980 round compared to the 1970 round, but a regression in the 1990 round.

Table 7. Number of countries or areas for which economically active population (EAP) and non-economically active population (NEA) data have been published in the DYB (up to the 1994 issue)

Region	1965-1974		1975-1984		1985-1994	
	EAP	NEA	EAP	NEA	EAP	NEA
Africa	24	<b>14</b>	27	<b>16</b>	21	<b>16</b>
North America	27	<b>24</b>	30	<b>26</b>	14	<b>7</b>
South America	10	<b>10</b>	11	<b>10</b>	7	<b>5</b>
Asia	22	<b>12</b>	30	<b>25</b>	19	<b>12</b>
Europe	32	<b>25</b>	31	<b>25</b>	27	<b>17</b>
Oceania	15	<b>9</b>	15	<b>10</b>	7	<b>2</b>
Total	130	<b>94</b>	144	<b>112</b>	95	<b>59</b>

### *Availability of age, sex and functional category breakdowns*

62. The numbers shown in table 6 include all NEA data published by the DYB for countries or areas, whether or not they provided data disaggregated by sex, age and functional category (student, homemaker, income recipient, other). If only those that provided data by sex, age and more than one functional category (not counting the residual) are counted, the corresponding number of countries for the three census rounds drops to 72, 99 and 54 (table 7). The drop in number of reporting countries providing complete breakdowns is due mainly to non-breakdown by age. The remaining portion of the drop is due to reporting only one functional category (see next para.), for example students; or to non-reporting of data by sex (two countries only). The good news here, just as was the case for EAP data, is that age, sex and functional category reporting has improved over the observed decades.

63. As mentioned above, some countries or areas effectively reported only one functional category. For example, Togo, Canada, Puerto Rico, St. Pierre and Miquelon (1967), United States, US Virgin Islands, France (in 1990), former Federal Rep. of Germany, Norway (in 1990), Sweden, Australia and Guam reported only students or students and other (residual category). Two countries (Bulgaria, New Zealand 1966) reported data for income recipients and other only, and one country (Ghana) reported data for homemaker and not stated only. (The countries identified with a year provided data for most, if not all, requested categories in either a previous or subsequent census.) It is worth investigating the reasons for reporting data on certain functional categories but not others.

### *Availability of urban/rural data*

64. As was the case with EAP data, urban/rural data for NEA were sparse. Overall, only nine of the 72 countries or areas (13%) that reported NEA by sex, age and functional category in the 1970 round also provided corresponding urban/rural data. The proportions improved in the 1980 and 1990 rounds to 22 out of 99 (22%) and 12 out

of 54 (22%), respectively (table 8). These proportions are somewhat lower than the corresponding urban/rural figures for EAP data.

Table 8. Number of countries or areas in the NEA tables in DYB that provided breakdowns by sex, age and functional category, and the number of these providing urban/rural breakdown

Region	1965-1974		1975-1984		1985-1994	
	With all breakdowns	Has U/R	With all breakdowns	Has U/R	With all breakdowns	Has U/R
Africa	11	2	13	4	14	4
North America	16	1	23	1	7	0
South America	9	1	10	2	5	1
Asia	11	4	25	9	12	3
Europe	21	1	18	5	14	3
Oceania	4	0	10	1	2	1
Total	72	9	99	22	54	12

### C. EAP by industry, by occupation and by status in employment

65. There is often wide interest in the distribution of the economically active population by industry, by occupation and by status in employment. Thus the DYB also publishes these three tables, by sex, age and urban/rural residence. In addition, it publishes a table on the EAP by industry cross-classified by status in employment, sex and urban/rural residence, and similarly on the EAP by occupation cross-classified by status in employment, sex and urban/rural residence.

#### *Response rates to tables on EAP by industry, by occupation and by status in employment*

66. As expected, availability of data decreased with the increase of breakdown variables requested. Overall, more countries were able to provide breakdown by industry than by occupation or status in employment. Of the 130 countries or areas that provided EAP data in the 1970 round, 106 were able to provide breakdowns by industry, while 91 and 97, respectively, were able to provide breakdowns by occupation and by status in employment. In terms of percentages, these translate to 82 per cent for data by industry, 70 per cent for occupation and 75 per cent for status in employment

(table 9). These proportions increased slightly in the 1980 round for industry and somewhat more for occupation and status in employment, bringing the percentages up to 84, 81 and 81 per cent, respectively. For the 1990 round there was a marked decline in available data for industry, occupation and status in employment. The decline was particularly significant for status in employment, so that only 81, 73 and 59 per cent, respectively, of countries providing EAP data were able to report such breakdowns by industry, occupation and status in employment for the 1990 round. A contributing factor to this observed regression in the 1990 round could be that at the time of preparation of the 1994 DYB, breakdowns by industry, by occupation and by status in employment were still in preparation. It is, however, also entirely possible that response to detailed tables have deteriorated in the 1990 round.

67. Availability of data was even lower for cross-tabulations of industry by status in employment and of occupation by status in employment. For the 1970 and 1980 rounds, just around 60 per cent of all countries or areas providing any EAP data were able to provide cross-tabulations on industry by status in employment, and a somewhat lower 55 per cent in the 1990 round. (Again the caution raised in the preceding paragraph on the possibility of incomplete availability of detailed tabulations for the 1990 round applies here). For cross-tabulations of occupation by status in employment, availability was around 50 per cent in all the three census rounds (table 9).

Table 9. Number and percentage of countries or areas for which data on various economic characteristics are available in the DYB (up to the 1994 issue), 1970, 1980 and 1990 rounds

Table	1965-1974		1975-1984		1985-1994	
	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*
EAP data	130	<b>100</b>	144	<b>100</b>	95	<b>100</b>
EAP by industry	106	<b>82</b>	121	<b>84</b>	77	<b>81</b>
EAP by occupation	91	<b>70</b>	116	<b>81</b>	69	<b>73</b>
EAP by status in employment	97	<b>75</b>	117	<b>81</b>	56	<b>59</b>
EAP by industry and status in emp	77	<b>59</b>	90	<b>63</b>	52	<b>55</b>
EAP by occupation and status in emp	61	<b>47</b>	75	<b>52</b>	50	<b>53</b>

\*The denominator is the number of countries or areas with basic EAP data, shown in the first row.

*Regional differences in data availability*

68. There were variations among regions in the extent of provision of data on the distribution of EAP by industry. In all census rounds studied, Africa had the lowest data availability, with 63 per cent, 67 per cent and 71 per cent of African countries or areas having EAP data by industry in the 1970, 1980 and 1990 rounds. For other regions, the proportion is higher, exceeding 70 per cent in all decades. Looking only at the 1970 and 1980 rounds (given the caution in para. 66), at least 80 per cent of countries or areas that reported EAP in Asia, Europe and North and South America also reported industrial breakdown, with Asia giving the best showing at more than 90 per cent in both census rounds. Remarkably, all countries in North America and Oceania that provided EAP were able to give breakdowns by industry in the 1990 round (table 10).
69. The corresponding proportions providing breakdowns for occupation are generally lower than those for industry in all regions but Africa. Europe showed low response levels for occupation, around 70 per cent in both 1970 and 1980 census rounds, while Asia showed the highest response, at 86 per cent and 97 per cent for the two census rounds. In South America, all countries that reported any EAP data were able to report occupational breakdown in 1980 round, a significant improvement over the 1970 round when only 60 per cent were able to do so. However, the proportion reporting occupational breakdown in South America dropped to 43 per cent in the 1990 round. In contrast, Africa and Oceania, while starting with a low percentage (63 and 53%, respectively), improved with each successive census round (table 10).
70. Reporting on status in employment for the 1970 and 1980 rounds ranged from 80 and 90 per cent for all regions except Africa and Oceania. In these two regions, only 50 and 47 per cent, respectively, of all countries or areas reporting EAP provided data by status in employment. There was improvement in these two regions in the

1980 round, with Africa approaching 80 per cent while Oceania still at 60 per cent (table 10).

Table 10. Number and percentage\* of countries or areas with data on economically active population by industry, by occupation and by status in employment in the DYB (up to the 1994 issue), by region, 1970, 1980 and 1990 rounds.

Region	1965-1974		1975-1984		1985-1994	
	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*
By industry						
Africa	15	<b>63</b>	18	<b>67</b>	15	<b>71</b>
North America	25	<b>93</b>	15	<b>83</b>	14	<b>100</b>
South America	8	<b>80</b>	11	<b>100</b>	5	<b>71</b>
Asia	20	<b>91</b>	28	<b>93</b>	15	<b>79</b>
Europe	27	<b>84</b>	28	<b>90</b>	21	<b>78</b>
Oceania	11	<b>73</b>	11	<b>73</b>	7	<b>100</b>
Total	106	<b>82</b>	121	<b>84</b>	77	<b>81</b>
By occupation						
Africa	15	<b>63</b>	19	<b>70</b>	17	<b>81</b>
North America	21	<b>78</b>	23	<b>77</b>	10	<b>71</b>
South America	6	<b>60</b>	11	<b>100</b>	3	<b>43</b>
Asia	19	<b>86</b>	29	<b>97</b>	15	<b>79</b>
Europe	22	<b>69</b>	22	<b>71</b>	17	<b>63</b>
Oceania	8	<b>53</b>	12	<b>80</b>	7	<b>100</b>
Total	91	<b>70</b>	116	<b>81</b>	69	<b>73</b>
By status in employment						
Africa	12	<b>50</b>	21	<b>78</b>	11	<b>52</b>
North America	24	<b>89</b>	27	<b>90</b>	10	<b>71</b>
South America	8	<b>80</b>	11	<b>100</b>	5	<b>71</b>
Asia	19	<b>86</b>	24	<b>80</b>	10	<b>53</b>
Europe	27	<b>84</b>	25	<b>81</b>	15	<b>56</b>
Oceania	7	<b>47</b>	9	<b>60</b>	5	<b>71</b>
Total	97	<b>75</b>	117	<b>81</b>	56	<b>59</b>

\*The denominator is the number of countries or areas for which basic EAP data are available, shown in table 3.

#### *Availability of age-sex breakdowns*

71. The majority of countries or areas reporting EAP by industry were able to report these data by age and sex. In the 1970 round, this percentage was 73 per cent, and increased to 85 per cent in 1980 round and 86 per cent in the 1990 round (table 11).

72. For occupation and status in employment, the figures were in the same range as for industry, with more than 80 per cent of countries or areas that report EAP able to provide age and sex breakdowns as well for both the 1980 and 1990 rounds. These represent significant improvements from the 1970 round (table 11).

Table 11. Number and percentage\* of countries or areas reporting age-sex breakdowns for data on industry, occupation or status in employment in the DYB (up to the 1994 issue), 1970, 1980 and 1990 rounds

	1965-1974		1975-1984		1985-1994	
	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*
With EAP by industry	106	<b>100</b>	121	<b>100</b>	77	<b>100</b>
With EAP by industry, age and sex	77	<b>73</b>	103	<b>85</b>	66	<b>86</b>
With EAP by occupation	91	<b>100</b>	116	<b>100</b>	69	<b>100</b>
With EAP by occupation, age and sex	68	<b>75</b>	100	<b>86</b>	59	<b>86</b>
With EAP by status in employment	97	<b>100</b>	117	<b>100</b>	56	<b>100</b>
With EAP by SE, age and sex	66	<b>68</b>	96	<b>82</b>	50	<b>89</b>

\*The denominator is the corresponding number of countries or areas with EAP data by industry/ occupation/ status in employment.

#### *Availability of urban/rural data*

73. Few countries provided urban/rural breakdown of EAP data by age, sex and industry. In the 1970, 1980 and 1990 census rounds, urban/rural breakdown was available for 15, 19 and 16 countries, respectively. Translating into percentages, only 19, 18 and 24 per cent of countries reporting EAP by age, sex and industry were able to report the data by urban/rural as well (table 12). These figures show a slight improvement in the 1990 round over the previous two periods and compare fairly well with the proportion of countries able to provide the basic EAP data by urban/rural (paras. 52 and 53; and table 6).

74. Just as with industry, few countries were able to provide detailed urban/rural data in the 1970 period (18%). The big difference is that in the 1980 and 1990 rounds, this proportion dropped significantly, to 10 and 8 per cent respectively (table 12).

75. The results for status in employment are in line with those for industry, with 15, 19 and 22 per cent of countries that report EAP by age, sex and status in employment able to provide breakdown of these data by urban/rural as well (table 12).

Table 12. Number and percentage\* of countries or areas reporting urban/rural breakdowns for EAP data by age, sex and industry, occupation or status in employment in the DYB (up to the 1994 issue), 1970, 1980 and 1990 rounds

	1965-1974		1975-1984		1985-1994	
	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*
With EAP by age, sex and industry	77	<b>100</b>	103	<b>100</b>	66	<b>100</b>
With EAP by age, sex, industry and UR	15	<b>19</b>	19	<b>18</b>	16	<b>24</b>
With EAP by age, sex and occupation	68	<b>100</b>	100	<b>100</b>	59	<b>100</b>
With EAP by age, sex, occup. and U/R	12	<b>17</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	<b>8</b>
With EAP by age, sex and SE	66	<b>100</b>	96	<b>100</b>	50	<b>100</b>
With EAP by age, sex, SE and U/R	10	<b>15</b>	18	<b>19</b>	11	<b>22</b>

\*The denominator is the corresponding number of countries with EAP data by age, sex and industry/ occupation/ status in employment.

#### *Employed population versus economically active population*

76. It should be noted that some of the data presented above on the economically active population by industry, by occupation or by status in employment actually refer to employed population only. As many as 33 per cent of the countries reporting industry data provided data on employed persons rather than on economically active persons in the 1970 round. This proportion increased to 38 per cent in 1980 round and further to 57 per cent in the 1990 round (table 13).



77. The corresponding proportions of countries reporting data on employed persons are lower in the case of occupation and status in employment but the trend is the same as that observed for industry, towards a higher proportion of countries providing data on employed persons (table 13).
78. By the 1990 round, around half or more of the reporting countries are providing industry, occupation and status in employment data on employed persons, although the request was on EAP in the UNSD questionnaire. If this trend continues, then countries reporting on employed persons will far exceed those reporting on economically active population in the 2000 round. This has implications for the data collection of UNSD, which currently requests tabulations of economically active population by industry, occupation and status in employment in its population census questionnaire on economic characteristics (table 13).

Table 13. Number and percentage of countries providing data on employed persons by industry, occupation and status in employment, 1970, 1980 and 1990 census rounds

	1965-1974		1975-1984		1985-1994	
	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*
Countries providing data by industry	106	<b>100</b>	121	<b>100</b>	77	<b>100</b>
Data provided on employed persons	35	<b>33</b>	46	<b>38</b>	44	<b>57</b>
Countries providing data by occupation	91	<b>100</b>	116	<b>100</b>	69	<b>100</b>
Data provided on employed persons	18	<b>20</b>	42	<b>36</b>	36	<b>52</b>
Countries providing data by SE	97	<b>100</b>	117	<b>100</b>	56	<b>100</b>
Data provided on employed persons	20	<b>21</b>	45	<b>38</b>	27	<b>48</b>

\*The denominator is the corresponding number of countries or areas providing data by industry/ occupation/ status in employment.

#### **D. Female economically active population by marital status**

##### *Response rate to the table on female EAP by marital status*

79. The table on female economically active population by marital status garnered the lowest response among the eight tables requested in the UNSD questionnaire on

economic characteristics. Among countries or areas that provided basic EAP data, around 40 per cent were able to also provide female EAP data by marital status. This is true in all the three census rounds reviewed (table 14).

Table 14. Number and percentage of countries or areas providing data on female economically active population by marital status, 1970, 1980 and 1990 census rounds

	1965-1974	1975-1984	1985-1994
With EAP data	130	144	95
With female EAP by marital status: Number	52	61	37
Percentage	40	42	39

\*The denominator is the number of countries or areas for which basic EAP data are available.

#### *Availability of age-sex breakdowns*

80. For the 1990 round, as many as 92 per cent of countries or areas providing data on female EAP by marital status were able to give age breakdowns. This is an improvement over the 1970 and 1980 census rounds, when the corresponding percentages were 85 and 77 per cent, respectively (table 15).

Table 15. Number and percentage of countries or areas providing data on female economically active population by marital status and age, 1970, 1980 and 1990 census rounds

	1965-1974	1975-1984	1985-1994
With female EAP by marital status (MS)	52	61	37
With female EAP by MS and age: Number	44	47	34
Percentage	85	77	92

\*The denominator is the number of countries or areas for which data on female EAP by marital status are available.

#### **IV. Suggestions and points for discussion**

81. All of the proposals made below should be considered in the context of the recommendations of the Expert Group Meeting to Review the United Nations *Demographic Yearbook* System, held in New York in November 2003. (For the final report of the meeting, see [http://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic/workshop/EGM\\_dyb/docs/no\\_L4.pdf](http://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic/workshop/EGM_dyb/docs/no_L4.pdf).)

##### ***On data collection***

82. Many comments were offered in part I of this report with regard to the UNSD population census questionnaire on economic characteristics. The salient points are given below, but the reader interested in more detail should go through the relevant text (paras. 8-17) in part I, section B.
- a. The UNSD questionnaire on economic characteristics should include, in its instruction pages, the ILO definition of economic activity and economically active population recognized by the 1998 recommendations. Countries should be asked to indicate whether they adopted the given definitions for their census and, if not, to clearly provide the definitions they used;
  - b. UNSD should also consider collecting the following metadata in its questionnaire on economic characteristics: (i) concept used (currently active or usually active); (ii) reference period (day, week, month, year, other);
  - c. The questionnaire should be revised to follow the 1998 recommendations on economic classifications and the fact that many countries have indeed shifted to the new classifications for industry, occupation and status in employment (ISIC rev.3, ISCO-88 and ICSE-1993, respectively). However, allowance should be made for countries that have not yet adopted the new classifications;
  - d. With the majority of countries now reporting breakdowns by industry, occupation and status in employment of employed persons rather than of the economically active population, UNSD should, in consultations with the

ILO, review and decide whether to continue asking these breakdowns for the EAP or shift to employed persons. Narrowing the population to employed persons may simplify data processing and improve comparability, as countries have different practices regarding treatment of unemployed persons seeking work for the first time questions (or other subgroups) vis-à-vis the questions on industry, occupation and status in employment.

Whatever the decision, UNSD needs to ascertain from the respondent which population (the economically active population or the employed population) the breakdowns provided refer to. If a country reports on the economically active population, it should be asked to indicate how unemployed persons seeking work for the first time are treated in the tabulations.

- e. UNSD should make sure that the lowest age adopted for enumerating the economically active population is indicated in the returned questionnaire. Moreover, space should be provided for entering additional age groups in the relevant tables, to accommodate at least two age groups, 5-9 and 10-14 (or narrower intervals, depending on the lowest age). For countries that ask the economic questions to persons below 10 years of age, the first age group might be 5-9, 6-9, 7-9, 8-9 or 9, as the case may be. For those whose minimum age is higher than 9, the first age group might be 10-14, 11-14, etc.
- f. Revision of the UNSD population questionnaire on economic characteristics should be made in consultation with ILO, given their mandate in the area of economic activity and employment, and to harmonize definitions and methods used by the two organizations.

83. The review and analysis in Part III show that after some improvements in country coverage from the 1970 to the 1980 round, there was regression in the 1990 round. Since much of the potential data on economic characteristics from the 1990 census round had not been disseminated by 1994 (the last DYB issue to feature economic characteristics), UNSD should collect economic characteristics data for the 1990 round for countries that have not reported them, at the same time that it is collecting data for the 2000 round. UNSD should also seriously consider disseminating, in their

next dissemination cycle, economic characteristics data for at least the 1990 and 2000 rounds.

84. If resources permit, UNSD should consider filling past data gaps for countries that do not undertake regular labour force or household surveys. For these countries, censuses are likely to be the only source for economic characteristics data.
  
85. To improve country coverage, UNSD should:
  - a. Improve data sharing arrangements with ILO, as there are benefits to be derived for both UNSD and ILO by such cooperation, not to mention reduction of response burden on countries;
  - b. Make a concerted effort to obtain better and more complete response, for example by using friendly questionnaires with clear instructions, improving questionnaire transmittal methods and following up with respondents;
  - c. Make better use of available national census publications and acquire, in a systematic way, census publications from countries. In this connection, it might be noted that countries often publish census results in several volumes, and economic characteristics tend to be included in the later volumes that countries may not disseminate as enthusiastically as they do their first volumes.
  
86. Given the increased demand for more detailed statistics, UNSD should review the 1998 recommendations with a view to expanding its collection and dissemination of economic characteristics data from population censuses. The review process might include evaluating national capacity to respond to an expanded set of tables by internally examining recent national census reports for the extent to which proposed new tables are already being produced and disseminated by countries.

### ***On dissemination***

87. For tables to be more useful, UNSD might consider presenting rates, percentages and percentage distributions. These summary figures may be calculated by UNSD or provided by countries. Introduction of any of these summary statistics should be weighed carefully for relevance, technical merit and implementability.
88. The tables on economic characteristics contain an enormous amount of data. With the current state of information technology, it is no longer sufficient to disseminate the data solely in print form. To increase utilization of these data, UNSD needs to make the data accessible to users in a much friendlier format than the print DYB. Dissemination in a database or similarly convenient format will have to happen soon.
89. The presentation of the table on population by type of activity should be reviewed. A possibility is to separate data on the currently active from those on the usually active. These are two different concepts that warrant distinction for analytical and comparability purposes. To be able to differentiate the data, UNSD has to collect information on the concept of activity used in the census, as well as on the reference period. The collection of these additional data has been suggested in para. 82b. Alternative sources of such information are ILO's compilation, as well as national census schedules and enumerator's manuals.
90. The DYB table on economically active population by age and sex shows the lowest age group as either "-15" or a closed age group encompassing the lowest age through age 14 (for example 7-14). In countries where the lowest age for asking economic questions is below 10, it would be useful to break down data for children by 5-year age groups, for example 5-9 and 10-14, to allow for a more detailed study of child labour. The youngest age group may not necessarily cover 5 years; for example, if a country asked economic characteristic questions of persons aged 7 and above, then the age breakdown should be 7-9, 10-14, etc. It is suggested that the tabulation of

data for the lowest ages be brought up for discussion in the upcoming updating of the *Principles and Recommendations for Population and Housing Censuses*.

91. The interval between issues of the special topic on economic characteristics as well as the period covered in each issue need to be revisited. The aim is to enable the inclusion of all responses received from countries, even if they are received late (see discussion in paras. 54-56). A suggestion is to report the last two available censuses for each country or area. If future dissemination will be in electronic form, UNSD could consider making longer historical data available to users.

## **Annex 1. List of tables reviewed**

Table 1. Economically active population and activity rates by sex, age and urban/rural residence

Table 2. Population not economically active by functional category, sex, age and urban/rural residence

Table 3. Economically active population by industry, sex, age and urban/rural residence

Table 4. Economically active population by occupation, sex, age and urban/rural residence

Table 5. Economically active population by status, sex, age and urban/rural residence

Table 6. Economically active population by industry, status, sex and urban/rural residence

Table 7. Economically active population by occupation, status, sex and urban/rural residence

Table 8. Female economically active population by marital status, age and urban/rural residence



**Annex 2. Years in which population censuses were conducted, by continent and country or area, for the 1970, 1980, 1990 and 2000 rounds of censuses, and whether their EAP data have been published in the DYB (up to the 1994 issue)**  
(Years shown in boldface are those for which any EAP data have been published in the DYB.)

	1970 round	1980 round	1990 round	2000 round
AFRICA				
Algeria	<b>1966</b>	<b>1977</b>	<b>1987</b>	1998
Angola	<b>1970</b>	1983		
Benin (Dahomey)		<b>1979</b>	<b>1992</b>	2002
Botswana	<b>1971</b>	<b>1981</b>	<b>1991</b>	2001
Burkina Faso (Upper Volta)		1975	1985	1996
Burundi	<b>1965</b>	<b>1979</b>	<b>1990</b>	
Cameroon		<b>1976</b>	1987	
Cape Verde	<b>1970</b>	1980	<b>1990</b>	2000
Central African Republic		<b>1975</b>	1988	2003
Chad			1993	
Comoros	1966	<b>1980</b>	<b>1991</b>	2003
Congo	<b>1974</b>	<b>1984</b>	1994	
Cote d'Ivoire		<b>1975</b>	<b>1988</b>	1998
Dem. Republic of the Congo		1984		
Djibouti		1983		
Egypt	1966	<b>1976</b>	<b>1986</b>	1996
Equatorial Guinea		1983	1994	2002
Eritrea				
Ethiopia		1984	1994	
Gabon	1970	1981	1993	
Gambia	1973	1983	1993	2003
Ghana	<b>1970</b>	<b>1984</b>		2000
Guinea	1972	1983		1996
Guinea-Bissau	1970	<b>1979</b>	1991	
Kenya	1969	1979	1989	1999
Lesotho	<b>1966</b>	1976	1986	1996
Liberia	<b>1974</b>	1984		
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	<b>1973</b>			1995
Madagascar		1974/75	1993	
Malawi	1966	<b>1977</b>	<b>1987</b>	1998
Mali		<b>1976</b>	1987	1998
Mauritania		1976	<b>1988</b>	2000
Mauritius	<b>1972</b>	1983	<b>1990</b>	2000
Morocco	<b>1971</b>	<b>1982</b>	1994	
Mozambique	1970	<b>1980</b>		1997
Namibia	<b>1970</b>		<b>1991</b>	2001
Niger		<b>1977</b>	<b>1988</b>	2001
Nigeria	1973		1991	

## Annex 2. (cont'd)

(Years shown in boldface are those for which economic activity data are available in the DYB.)

	1970 round		1980 round		1990 round		2000 round
Réunion	<b>1967</b>	1974	<b>1982</b>		<b>1990</b>		1999
Rwanda			<b>1978</b>		<b>1991</b>		2002
Saint Helena	<b>1966</b>		<b>1976</b>		<b>1987</b>		1998
Sao Tome and Principe	1970		<b>1981</b>		<b>1991</b>		2001
Senegal			<b>1976</b>		1988		2001
Seychelles	<b>1971</b>		<b>1977</b>		<b>1987</b>	1994	1997 2002
Sierra Leone	1974				1985		
Somalia			1975		1987		
South Africa	<b>1970</b>		<b>1980</b>		<b>1985</b>	1991	1996 2001
Sudan	1973		1983		1993		
Swaziland	<b>1966</b>		<b>1976</b>		<b>1986</b>		1997
Togo	<b>1970</b>		1981				
Tunisia	<b>1966</b>		1975	<b>1984</b>	1994		
Uganda	1969		1980		1991		2002
United Republic of Tanzania	<b>1967</b>		1978		1988		2002
Western Sahara (Sp. Sahara)	<b>1970</b>						
Zambia	<b>1969</b>		<b>1980</b>		1990		2000
Zimbabwe (S. Rhodesia)	<b>1969</b>		<b>1982</b>		<b>1992</b>		2002
NORTH AMERICA							
Antigua and Barbuda	<b>1970</b>				1991		2001
Aruba			<b>1981</b>		<b>1991</b>		2000
Bahamas	<b>1970</b>		<b>1980</b>		<b>1990</b>		2000
Barbados	<b>1970</b>		<b>1980</b>		1990		2000
Belize	<b>1970</b>		<b>1980</b>		<b>1991</b>		2000
Bermuda	<b>1970</b>		<b>1980</b>		<b>1991</b>		2000
British Virgin Islands	<b>1970</b>		<b>1980</b>		1991		2001
Canada	1966	1971	1976	1981	1986	1991	1996 2001
Cayman Islands	<b>1970</b>		<b>1979</b>		<b>1989</b>		1999
Costa Rica	<b>1973</b>		<b>1984</b>				2000
Cuba	1970		<b>1981</b>				2002
Dominica	1970		<b>1981</b>		1991		2001
Dominican Republic	1970		1981		1993		2002
El Salvador	<b>1971</b>				1992		
Greenland	<b>1965</b>	1970	<b>1976</b>		[AR]		[AR]
Grenada	1970		<b>1981</b>		1991		2001
Guadeloupe	<b>1967</b>	<b>1974</b>	<b>1982</b>		<b>1990</b>		1997
Guatemala	<b>1973</b>		<b>1981</b>		1994		2002
Haiti	<b>1971</b>		<b>1982</b>				2003
Honduras	<b>1974</b>				1988		2001
Jamaica	<b>1970</b>		<b>1982</b>		1991		2001

## Annex 2. (cont'd)

(Years shown in boldface are those for which economic activity data are available in the DYB.)

	1970 round		1980 round		1990 round		2000 round
Martinique	<b>1967</b>	<b>1974</b>	<b>1982</b>		<b>1990</b>		<b>1997</b>
Mexico	<b>1970</b>		<b>1980</b>		<b>1990</b>		<b>2000</b>
Montserrat	<b>1970</b>		<b>1980</b>		<b>1991</b>		<b>2001</b>
Netherlands Antilles	<b>1971</b>		<b>1981</b>		<b>1992</b>		<b>2001</b>
Nicaragua	<b>1971</b>						<b>1995</b>
Panama	<b>1970</b>		<b>1980</b>		<b>1990</b>		<b>2000</b>
Puerto Rico	<b>1970</b>		<b>1980</b>		<b>1990</b>		<b>2000</b>
Saint Kitts and Nevis	<b>1970</b>		<b>1980</b>		<b>1991</b>		<b>2001</b>
Saint Lucia	<b>1970</b>		<b>1980</b>		<b>1991</b>		<b>2001</b>
Saint Pierre and Miquelon	<b>1967</b>	<b>1974</b>	<b>1982</b>		<b>1990</b>		<b>1999</b>
Saint Vincent / Grenadines	<b>1970</b>		<b>1980</b>		<b>1991</b>		<b>2001</b>
Trinidad and Tobago	<b>1970</b>		<b>1980</b>		<b>1990</b>		<b>2000</b>
Turks and Caicos Islands	<b>1970</b>		<b>1980</b>		<b>1990</b>		<b>2001</b>
United States	<b>1970</b>		<b>1980</b>		<b>1990</b>		<b>2000</b>
United States Virgin Islands	<b>1970</b>		<b>1980</b>		<b>1990</b>		<b>2000</b>
SOUTH AMERICA							
Argentina	<b>1970</b>		<b>1980</b>		<b>1991</b>		<b>2001</b>
Bolivia			<b>1976</b>		<b>1992</b>		<b>2001</b>
Brazil	<b>1970</b>		<b>1980</b>		<b>1991</b>		<b>1996</b> <b>2000</b>
Chile	<b>1970</b>		<b>1982</b>		<b>1992</b>		<b>2002</b>
Colombia	<b>1973</b>				<b>1985</b> <b>1993</b>		
Ecuador	<b>1974</b>		<b>1982</b>		<b>1990</b>		<b>2001</b>
Falkland Islands (Malvinas)	<b>1972</b>		<b>1980</b>		<b>1986</b> <b>1991</b>		<b>1996</b> <b>2001</b>
French Guiana	<b>1967</b>	<b>1974</b>	<b>1982</b>		<b>1990</b>		<b>1999</b>
Guyana	<b>1970</b>		<b>1980</b>		<b>1991</b>		<b>2002</b>
Paraguay	<b>1972</b>		<b>1982</b>		<b>1992</b>		<b>2002</b>
Peru	<b>1972</b>		<b>1981</b>		<b>1993</b>		
Suriname	<b>1971</b>		<b>1980</b>				<b>2003</b>
Uruguay			<b>1975</b>		<b>1985</b>		<b>1996</b>
Venezuela	<b>1971</b>		<b>1981</b>		<b>1990</b>		<b>2001</b>
ASIA							
Afghanistan			<b>1979</b>				
Armenia					<b>1989</b>		<b>2001</b>
Azerbaijan					<b>1989</b>		<b>1999</b>
Bahrain	<b>1971</b>		<b>1981</b>		<b>1991</b>		<b>2001</b>
Bangladesh	<b>1974</b>		<b>1981</b>		<b>1991</b>		<b>2001</b>
Bhutan	<b>1971</b>		<b>1981</b>				
Brunei Darussalam	<b>1971</b>		<b>1981</b>		<b>1991</b>		<b>2001</b>
Cambodia							<b>1998</b>

## Annex 2. (cont'd)

(Years shown in boldface are those for which economic activity data are available in the DYB.)

	1970 round		1980 round		1990 round		2000 round
China			<b>1982</b>		<b>1990</b>		2000
China, Hong Kong SAR	<b>1971</b>		<b>1976</b>	<b>1981</b>	<b>1986</b>	<b>1991</b>	1996 2001
China, Macao SAR	<b>1970</b>		<b>1981</b>		<b>1991</b>		2001
Cyprus					1992		2001
Georgia					1989		2002
India	<b>1971</b>		<b>1981</b>		<b>1991</b>		2001
Indonesia	<b>1971</b>		<b>1980</b>		<b>1990</b>		2000
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	<b>1966</b>		<b>1976</b>		<b>1986</b>	<b>1991</b>	1996
Iraq	1965		<b>1977</b>		1987		1997
Israel	<b>1972</b>		<b>1983</b>				1995
Japan	<b>1965</b>	<b>1970</b>	<b>1975</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>1985</b>	<b>1990</b>	1995 2000
Jordan			<b>1979</b>		1994		
Kazakhstan					<b>1989</b>		1999
Korea, Dem. People's Rep. of					1993		
Korea, Republic of	<b>1966</b>	<b>1970</b>	<b>1975</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>1985</b>	<b>1990</b>	1995 2000
Kuwait	<b>1965</b>	<b>1970</b>	<b>1975</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>1985</b>		1995
Kyrgyzstan					<b>1989</b>		1999
Lao People's Dem. Republic			1975		1985		1995
Lebanon							
Malaysia (West or Peninsular)	<b>1970</b>		<b>1980</b>		1991		2000
Maldives			<b>1977</b>		<b>1985</b>	<b>1990</b>	1995 2000
Mongolia	1969		1979		1989		2000
Myanmar	1973		<b>1983</b>				
Nepal	<b>1971</b>		<b>1981</b>		1991		2001
Occupied Palestinian Ter.							1997
Oman					1993		2003
Pakistan	1972		<b>1981</b>				1998
Philippines	<b>1970</b>		<b>1975</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>1990</b>		1995 2000
Qatar	1970				<b>1986</b>		1997
Saudi Arabia	1974				1992		
Singapore	<b>1970</b>		<b>1980</b>		<b>1990</b>		2000
Sri Lanka	<b>1971</b>		<b>1981</b>				2001
Syrian Arab Republic	<b>1970</b>		<b>1981</b>		1994		
Tajikistan					1989		2000
Thailand	<b>1970</b>		<b>1980</b>		<b>1990</b>		2000
Timor-Leste	1970				1990		
Turkey	<b>1965</b>	<b>1970</b>	<b>1975</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>1985</b>	<b>1990</b>	2000
Turkmenistan					1989		1995
United Arab Emirates	<b>1968</b>		<b>1975</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>1985</b>		1995
Uzbekistan					1989		
Viet Nam			<b>1979</b>		<b>1989</b>		1999

## Annex 2. (cont'd)

(Years shown in boldface are those for which economic activity data are available in the DYB.)

	1970 round	1980 round	1990 round	2000 round		
Yemen			1994			
Former Yemen Arab Rep		1975	1986			
Former Dem. Yemen Rep.	1973		1988			
EUROPE						
Albania	1969		1989		2001	
Andorra		1975	[AR]		[AR]	
Austria	1971	1981	1991		2001	
Belarus		1979	1989		1999	
Belgium	1970	1981	1991		2001	
Bosnia and Herzegovina			1991			
Bulgaria	1965	1975	1985	1992	2001	
Channel Islands	1971	1981	1986	1991	1996	2001
Croatia			1991		2001	
(Former) Czechoslovakia	1970	1980				
Czech Republic			1991		2001	
Denmark	1970	1976	1981	1991 [AR]	2001 [AR]	
Estonia			1989		2000	
Faeroe Islands	1966	1970	1977	[AR]	[AR]	
Finland [AR]	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995
France	1968	1975	1982	1990		1999
Germany						
Fed Rep Germany (former)	1970		1987			
German Dem Rep (former)	1971	1981				
Gibraltar	1970	1981	1991		2001	
Greece	1971	1981	1991		2001	
Hungary	1970	1980	1990		2001	
Iceland		1981	[AR]		[AR]	
Ireland	1966	1971	1981	1986	1991	1996
Isle of Man	1966	1971	1976	1981	1986	1991
Ireland						1996
Italy	1971	1981	1991		2001	
Latvia			1989		2000	
Liechtenstein	1966	1970	1981	1990	2000	
Lithuania			1989		2001	
Luxembourg	1966	1970	1981	1991	2001	
Malta	1967		1985		1995	
Monaco	1968	1975	1982	1990		2000 [AR]
Netherlands	1971		1991		2002	
Norway	1970		1980	1990	2001	
Poland	1966	1970	1978	1988	2002	
Portugal	1970	1981	1991		2001	

## Annex 2. (cont'd)

(Years shown in boldface are those for which economic activity data are available in the DYB.)

	1970 round		1980 round		1990 round		2000 round	
<b>Republic of Moldova</b>					<b>1989</b>			
Romania	<b>1966</b>		<b>1977</b>		<b>1992</b>		<b>2002</b>	
(Former) USSR	<b>1970</b>		<b>1979</b>					
Russian Federation					<b>1989</b>		<b>2002</b>	
San Marino			<b>1976</b>		[AR]		[AR]	
<b>Serbia and Montenegro</b>					<b>1991</b>		<b>2002</b>	
Slovakia					<b>1991</b>		<b>2001</b>	
Slovenia					<b>1991</b>		<b>2002</b>	
Spain	<b>1970</b>		<b>1981</b>		<b>1991</b>		<b>2001</b>	
Sweden	<b>1965</b>	<b>1970</b>	<b>1975</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>1985</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>1995</b>	[AR]
Switzerland	<b>1970</b>		<b>1980</b>		<b>1990</b>		<b>2000</b>	
<b>The FYR of Macedonia</b>					<b>1991</b>	<b>1994</b>	<b>2002</b>	
Ukraine	<b>1970</b>		<b>1979</b>		<b>1989</b>		<b>2001</b>	
United Kingdom	<b>1971</b>		<b>1981</b>		<b>1991</b>		<b>2001</b>	
(Former) Yugoslavia	<b>1971</b>		<b>1981</b>					
<b>OCEANIA</b>								
American Samoa	<b>1970</b>	<b>1974</b>	<b>1980</b>		<b>1990</b>		<b>2000</b>	
Australia	<b>1966</b>	<b>1971</b>	<b>1976</b>	<b>1981</b>	<b>1986</b>	<b>1991</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>2001</b>
Cook Islands	<b>1966</b>	<b>1971</b>	<b>1976</b>	<b>1981</b>	<b>1986</b>	<b>1991</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>2001</b>
Fiji	<b>1966</b>		<b>1976</b>		<b>1986</b>		<b>1996</b>	
French Polynesia	<b>1967</b>	<b>1971</b>	<b>1977</b>		<b>1988</b>		<b>1996</b>	
Guam	<b>1970</b>		<b>1980</b>		<b>1990</b>		<b>2000</b>	
Kiribati (Gilbert & Ellice Is)	<b>1968</b>	<b>1973</b>	<b>1978</b>		<b>1985</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>1995</b>	<b>2000</b>
<b>Marshall Islands</b>					<b>1988</b>		<b>1999</b>	
<b>Micronesia (Fed. States of)</b>					<b>1985-89</b>	<b>1994</b>	<b>2000</b>	
Nauru	<b>1966</b>		<b>1977</b>		<b>1992</b>		<b>2002</b>	
New Caledonia	<b>1969</b>		<b>1976</b>	<b>1983</b>	<b>1989</b>		<b>1996</b>	
New Zealand	<b>1966</b>	<b>1971</b>	<b>1976</b>	<b>1981</b>	<b>1986</b>	<b>1991</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>2001</b>
Niue	<b>1966</b>	<b>1971</b>	<b>1976</b>	<b>1981</b>	<b>1986</b>	<b>1991</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>2001</b>
<b>Northern Mariana Islands</b>					<b>1990</b>		<b>1995</b>	<b>2000</b>
<b>Palau</b>			<b>1980</b>		<b>1986</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>1995</b>	<b>2000</b>
Papua New Guinea	<b>1966</b>	<b>1971</b>	<b>1980</b>		<b>1990</b>		<b>2000</b>	
Samoa (Western Samoa)	<b>1966</b>	<b>1971</b>	<b>1976</b>	<b>1981</b>	<b>1986</b>	<b>1991</b>	<b>2001</b>	
Solomon Islands	<b>1970</b>		<b>1976</b>		<b>1986</b>		<b>1999</b>	
Tokelau	<b>1972</b>		<b>1976</b>		<b>1986</b>	<b>1991</b>	<b>2001</b>	
Tonga	<b>1966</b>		<b>1976</b>		<b>1986</b>		<b>1996</b>	
<b>Tuvalu</b>	<b>1968</b>	<b>1973</b>	<b>1979</b>		<b>1985</b>	<b>1991</b>	<b>2002</b>	
Vanuatu (New Hebrides)	<b>1967</b>		<b>1979</b>		<b>1986</b>	<b>1989</b>	<b>1999</b>	

[AR]: From administrative registers.

