Central Statistical Bureau Customer Survey

Riga, January – February 2006

CONTENT

TECHNICAL INFORMATION ON THE SURVEY

Type of survey	**Postal survey**
Number of initial contacts	**100**
Number of valid contacts	**96**
Number of responding institutions	**67**
Response rate	**69.8%**

SURVEY RESULTS

1. Characterization of the CSB information users

Among the surveyed 67 institutions the most often used statistics sector is business statistics. Different business statistics sectors are regularly used by 49 surveyed institutions or 73 %; a half of the surveyed institutions stated that they use trade and services statistics (34 institutions or 51 %) and tourism and transport statistics (33 institutions or 49 %); construction statistics (30 institutions or 45 %) and industrial and energy industry statistics (30 institutions or 45 %) were mentioned slightly less often. The second most often mentioned sector is income and living conditions statistics, regularly used by 48 or 72 % of the surveyed institutions.

Two thirds of the surveyed institutions regularly use demographic statistics (46 institutions or 69 %) and employment statistics (45 institutions or 67 %), slightly less often, but still regularly used sector is the price statistics (41 institutions or 61 %).

Other statistics sectors are regularly used by less than a half of the surveyed institutions: foreign trade statistics are regularly used by 29 institutions or 43 %, national accounts statistics – by 28 or 42 % of institutions, public finance statistics – by 26 or 39 % of institutions, agricultural and environmental statistics are regularly used by 20 institutions or 30 %. Other statistics sectors such as information society statistics, cultural statistics, health statistics and regional statistics are used by 9 institutions or 13 %.

Table 1. Use of different statistics sectors (%)

What are the statistics sectors that you refer to on a regular basis?

Business statistics	73
Trade and services statistics	*51*
Tourism and transport statistics	*49*
Construction statistics	*45*
Industrial and energy industry statistics	*45*
Income and living conditions statistics	72
Demographic statistics	69
Employment statistics	67
Price statistics	61
Foreign trade statistics	43
National accounts statistics	42
Public finance statistics	39
Agricultural and environmental statistics	30
Other	13
N=67	
More than one answer could be chosen thus the answer sum in % is above 100 %.	699%

When characterising the use of different statistics sector data on a regular basis and type of institutions, several statistically significant differences can be observed. Private companies, their organisations and banks more often mentioned regular use of business statistics (92 % of private and 63 % of state and municipal institutions), trade and services statistics (67 % of private and 41 % of state and municipal institutions) and foreign trade statistics (58 % of private and 31 % of state and municipal

institutions). State and municipal institutions mentioned other statistics sectors not included in the list, while private institutions did not mention such sectors.

Table.2. Use of different statistics sectors and type of institution (%)

What are the statistics sectors that you refer to on a regular basis?

	State institutions, municipalities, embassies	Private companies, their organisations, and banks
Demographic statistics	72	67
Employment statistics	69	75
Income and living conditions statistics	66	83
Business statistics	63**	92**
Tourism and transport statistics	50	58
Trade and services statistics	41**	67**
Construction statistics	41	58
Industrial and energy industry statistics	38	58
Price statistics	56	67
National accounts statistics	56	38
Public finance statistics	44	42
Foreign trade statistics	31**	58**
Agricultural and environmental statistics	31	29
Other	28**	-**
N	32	24

**Differences are statistically significant according to Chi-Square criteria with 95 % confidence.

When characterising statistical data sources, institutions most often mentioned that they use the Web site of the CSB (57 institutions or 85 %) and different publications of the statistical data (yearbooks, booklets, data compilations) (56 institutions or 84 %). Three fourths of institutions mentioned that they use on-line databases of the CSB (50 institutions or 75 %).

Publications or Web sites and public databases of European institutions (e.g. Eurostat) were used for data acquisition by 41 institutions or 61 %, the CSB press releases (38 institutions or 57 %) and results of analyses and research (38 institutions or 57 %) were used slightly less often for data acquisition.

Less than a half of the surveyed institutions stated that for acquisition of the statistical data they use publications or Web sites and public databases of international institutions (e.g. OECD, UN, IMF) (32 institution or 48 %) and information published in mass media (29 institutions or 45 %). One third of the surveyed institutions acquired data using customised data processing services (tailor-made reports) of the CSB (25 institution or 37 %).

Out of all institutions 9 or 13 % of the surveyed data users mentioned such other statistical data acquisition sources as Web sites and publications of different institutions of Latvia and other countries.

When characterising different statistical data acquisition sources and type of institutions, several statistically significant differences can be observed in the use of the CSB Web site according to the type of institutions: state institutions, municipalities and embassies used the CSB Web site for acquisition of data more often (92 %) than private institutions (75 %).

Table 3. Use of different statistical data sources (%)

Where do you obtain statistical data?

From the CSB Web site	85
From statistical publications (yearbooks, booklets, data compilations)	84
From the CSB on-line data bases	75
From the publications/Web sites and public data bases of the EU institutions (e.g. Eurostat)	61
From the CSB press releases	57
From results of analyses and studies	57
From the publications/Web sites and public databases of international institutions	48
From information published in the mass media	43
From customised data processing services (tailor-made reports)	37
Other sources of statistical data acquisition	13
N=66	
More than one answer could be chosen thus the total in % is above 100 %.	560%

There are no differences in statistical data sources used by particular types of institutions (public institution, private institution), but several statistically significant differences can be observed in statistical data sources used by institutions, which regularly make use of particular statistics sectors.

From the surveyed institutions the CSB on-line databases were more often used by institutions regularly using employment statistics (59 % of institutions not using employments statistics and 82 % of institutions using employment statistics); the difference is statistically significant.

The CSB press releases as a source was more often mentioned by institutions regularly using construction and industrial and energy industry statistics (77 %), national accounts statistics (75 %), trade and services statistics (74 %), price statistics (71 %), tourism and transport statistics (70 %), employment statistics (69 %) and demographic statistics (65 %).

Similarly, data processing services were more often used by institutions regularly using agricultural and environmental statistics (65 %), construction statistics (53 %), industrial and energy industry statistics (53 %), foreign trade statistics (52 %), trade and services statistics (52 %), tourism and transport statistics (52 %) and employment statistics (49 %).

Out of the responding institutions 94 % mentioned that when using the CSB data, they refer to the CSB as the data source, 1 institution does not state the data source and 4 institutions did not answer the question.

When characterising purposes of data use, almost all institutions surveyed (63 or 96 %) use the statistical data for the analysis of the current situation and for short-term planning. Three thirds (48 institutions or 74 %) use statistical data for analysis of trends and long-term policy formulation.

Slightly less than a half of the surveyed institutions use statistical data for educational purposes (28 institutions or 42 %), while approximately one third uses data for scientific research (24 institutions or 36 %) and repeated dissemination of statistical data (24 institutions or 36 %).

One in every five surveyed institutions uses the statistical data for econometric modelling and forecasting (14 institutions or 21 %). Out of all institutions 2 (3 %) stated other purpose – information is used in different presentations and justification of institution's activities for a wider audience and the mass media.

Table 4. Different purposes of statistical data use (%)

For what purposes do you use national statistical data?

For the analysis of current situation and short-term planning	96
For the analysis of trends and long-term policy formulation	74
For educational purposes	42
For scientific research	36
For repeated dissemination of statistical data	36
For econometric modelling and forecasting	21
Other	3
N=66	
More than one answer could be chosen thus the total in % is above 100 %.	309%

Statistically significant differences can be observed in the data use by state and municipal, and private institutions for econometric modelling and forecasting, which is the purpose more often mentioned by private institutions (42 %) rather than by state and municipal institutions (6 %); and for the educational purposes, which is the reason more often mentioned by state and municipal institutions (50 %) rather than by private institutions (29 %).

Several statistically significant differences in the purposes of data use can be observed according to the type of data used by institutions on a regular basis. Data users regularly using demographic statistics data more often stated that the purpose of statistic data usage is the analysis of trends, long-term policy formulation (83 %) and educational purposes (54%).

The statistical data for econometric modelling and forecasting is used slightly more often by institution regularly using income and living conditions statistics (27 %) and national accounts statistics (32 %). Institutions regularly using national accounts statistics and public finance statistics more often use the statistical data for their repeated dissemination (54 % of institutions regularly using public finance statistics and 50 % of institutions regularly using national accounts statistics).

Statistically significant coherence can also be observed between the purposes of statistical data usage and sources of the statistical data acquisition. Institutions using data for their repeated dissemination more often stated that they use such sources as the CSB on-line databases (92 % of institutions using data for their repeated dissemination and 65 % of institutions without such purposes), as well as more often used customised data processing (tailor-made data) services (54 %). Similarly these institutions more often used publications/Web sites and public databases of EU institutions (e.g. Eurostat) (79 %).

Institutions using data for the analysis of trends and the long-term policy formulation more often used the information published in mass media (51 %) and results of analyses and studies (71 %) as statistical data sources.

Institutions using information for scientific research considerably less often mentioned use of information published in mass media (25 %) as data source, but more often – publications/Web sites and public databases of the EU institutions (e.g.

Eurostat) (79 %) and publications/Web sites and public databases of international institutions (e.g. OECD, UN, IMF) (67 %). Also institutions using data for the econometric modelling and forecasting more often stated that they use publications/Web sites and public databases of international organisations (e.g. OECD, UN, IMF) (79 %).

Institutions mentioning educational purposes of the data usage more often stated that such sources as results of analyses and studies (75 %) and publications/Web sites and public databases of the EU institutions (e.g. Eurostat) (79 %) are used as data sources. For the same purposes also other statistical data sources were used more often – Web sites and publications of institutions of Latvia and other countries (25 %).

Different statistical data are used in international comparisons by almost all surveyed institutions. Most often institutions stated that in international comparisons employment statistics (39 institutions or 59 %) as well as demographic statistics and income and living conditions statistics (respectively by 37 institutions or 56 % of institutions each) are used. Business statistics were mentioned slightly less often (36 institutions or 55 %): industrial and energy industry statistics are used in international comparisons by 20 institutions or 30 %, trade and services, and tourism and transports statistics – by 16 institutions or 24 %, but construction statistics – by 12 institutions or 18 %. More than a half of the surveyed institutions in international comparisons use the price statistics (35 institutions or 53 %).

Other statistics sectors are used in international comparisons by less than a half of the surveyed: foreign trade statistics was mentioned by 29 institutions or 44 %, national accounts statistics and public finance statistics respectively by 25 institutions or 44 % and 20 institutions or 38 %, but the least frequently used statistics sector by the surveyed institutions is agricultural and environmental statistics sector – mentioned only by 12 institutions or 18 %.

Statistical data of other countries are not used only by 5 institutions or 8 %.

When comparing usage of different statistics sectors between state and municipal, and private institutions, construction statistics in international comparisons is used more often by private institutions (33 %) as are trade and services statistics (38 %) and industrial and industry power statistics (50 %). It is to be noted that business statistics in general are more often used on a regular basis by private institutions.

Statistically significant coherences can also be observed between usage of statistics sectors for international comparisons and statistical data acquisition sources.

Institutions using employment statistics for international comparisons, more often use results of analyses and studies (77 %), the CSB press releases (69 %) and the information published in mass media (54 %). Similarly also institutions using demographic statistics for international comparisons, comparatively more often utilise results of analyses and studies (81 %), the CSB press releases (73 %) and the information published in mass media (62 %).

Table 5. Use of data of different statistics sectors in international comparisons (%)

Data of which foreign statistics sectors do you use for comparison of processes in Latvia and other countries?

Employment statistics	59
Demographic statistics	56
Income and living conditions statistics	56
Business statistics	55
Industrial and energy industry statistics	*30*
Trade and services statistics	*24*
Tourism and transport statistics	*24*
Construction statistics	*18*
Price statistics	53
Foreign trade statistics	44
National accounts statistics	38
Public finance statistics	30
Agricultural and environmental statistics	18
None, I do not use statistical data of other states	8
N=66	
More than one answer could be chosen thus the answer sum in % is above 100 %.	514%

Results of analyses and studies are more often used also by institutions, which use business statistics for international comparisons: industrial and energy industry statistics (85 %), construction statistics (83 %) and tourism and transport statistics (81 %). Users of industrial and energy industry statistics more often use the CSB press releases (75 %) as well as customised (tailor-made) data processing services (55 %). Customised data processing services are comparatively more often used also by users of tourism and transport statistics (69 %).

Users of national accounts statistics in comparisons more often used publications of the statistical data (96%), publications/Web sites and public databases of different EU institutions (e.g. Eurostat) (80 %) as well as publications/Web sites and public databases of international institutions (e.g. OECD, UN, IMF) (64 %) as the statistical data sources. Institutions using public finance statistics for comparisons more often utilise results of analyses and studies (85 %) and publications and Web sites of international institutions (75 %).

Institutions using the price statistics for international comparisons comparatively more often used the CSB press releases (71 %), results of analyses and studies (69 %) and data published in mass media (57%).

2. Quality of statistical data and methodological information compiled by the CSB

Within the field of research, representatives of the surveyed institutions provided assessment of general quality of the statistical data, evaluated the data quality in comparison with other European countries, as well as noted whether the methodology of the statistical data, in their opinion, is appropriate and accurately developed.

2.1. General statistical data quality assessment

General quality assessment of the Latvian statistical data of particular statistics sectors was provided by 43 % - 70 % of institutions (or 29 - 47 respondents).

Survey results show that in general the quality of the statistical data is assessed positively: on a five-point scale (where "1" is the lowest and "5" the highest score) the lowest score ("1" and "2") for particular statistics sectors where given considerably less often (3 % - 13 %) than the highest score (score "4" and "5" for particular statistics sectors were given by 48 % - 79 % of respondents giving assessment).

Comparatively better valued is the general quality of demographic statistics and price statistics: on a five-point scale, where "1" is the lowest and "5" the highest assessment, the average assessment values of these sectors are respectively 3.98 and 3.91.

Slightly lower assessment was given to such sectors as agricultural and environmental statistics (the average value: 3.76), employment statistics (3.67), income and living conditions statistics (3.64), public finance statistics (3.63.), national accounts statistics (3.62) and foreign trade statistics (3.58).

Less positively valued are business statistics in general (the average value of assessments is 3.38), although assessments for its separate fields are slightly higher: the average value of construction statistics assessment is 3.62, tourism and transport statistics – 3.59, trade and services statistics – 3.48 and industrial and energy industry statistics – 3.47.

Table 6. General quality assessment of statistical data in different statistics sectors

How do you evaluate general quality of the Latvian statistical data? Please, choose a score, which, in your opinion, characterises the quality of statistics in a specific sector in a five-point scale, where "1" is the lowest score and "5" - the highest.

	Average score	N
Demographic statistics	3.98	47
Price statistics	3.91	43
Agricultural and environmental statistics	3.76	29
Employment statistics	3.67	42
Income and living conditions statistics	3.64	44
Public finance statistics	3.63	30
National accounts statistics	3.62	32
Foreign trade statistics	3.58	36
Business statistics	3.38	29
Construction statistics	*3.62*	*29*
Tourism and transport statistics	*3.59*	*32*
Trade and services statistics	*3.48*	*29*
Industrial and energy industry statistics	*3.47*	*30*
Other statistics sectors (including: information society statistics, cultural statistics, regional statistics, health statistics, other financial mediators statistics (each of the above was mentioned once))	2.80	5

Statistically significant differences can be observed in the data quality assessment of general statistics sectors made by state and municipal and private data users.

The private sector data users evaluate agricultural and environmental statistics considerably higher in comparison with the state and municipal institutions (4.10, n=10 and 3.57, n=14), as well as construction statistics (4.00, n=12 and 3.25, n=12) and trade and services statistics (3.75, n=12 and 3.25, n=12).

The general assessment of the statistics sector differs also according to the purposes of information use. Statistically significant differences can be observed in the assessment of income and living conditions and employment statistics by organisations, which use or do not use this data for econometric modelling. Data users not utilising this data for econometric modelling assessed them slightly higher: respectively income and living conditions statistics average assessment is 3.82 (n=33) in comparison with 3.09 (n=11), but the average assessment of employment statistics is 3.84 (n=31) in comparison with 3.18 (n=11). This indicates that data users utilising data for econometric modelling and forecasting are more demanding towards data quality and assess it more critically than other users.

Research participants were also given the possibility to **comment on their assessment**. In total this possibility was used by 18 % of institutions (or 12 from 67 respondents).

Several institutions criticised the level of detailed of statistical data. They stated that the following is to be accomplished:

- ✓ More detailed territorial division (major cities, district-level towns, rural municipalities, also data by regions is missing (industrial, employment, demographics statistics));
- ✓ More detailed business statistics according to the NACE classification;

- ✓ Supplement of the industrial statistics with the value added and other information (it was stated that Eurostat has a good level of detailed data elaboration);
- ✓ The educational statistics should include more analyses, comparisons, lack of data on inhabitants with several higher educations is to be tackled.

The methodology and methodological information of particular statistics sectors was also criticized:

- ✓ It was sated that methodological explanations for public finance statistics (PFS) and annual financial accounts (AFA) are insufficient. What concerns the PFS, it was stated that the methodology is not complete.
- ✓ What concerns construction statistics, it was stated that notions of the methodological information are unclear (respondent is not sure of the meaning of notions "flat", "dwelling", "living premises", "housing fund", etc.).
- ✓ Deficiencies in the household budget surveys were also indicated – small sample, rare inspections.

Participants of the survey rendered their commentaries also on timeliness of the data publication:

- ✓ Availability of business statistics (for the situation analysis data is necessary within 6 months after the reporting period, not within a year);
- ✓ Demographic statistics (it was stated that the data are obsolete);
- ✓ Employment statistics (these statistics have to be published at least once per quarter).

2.2. Quality assessment of statistical data in comparison with other European countries

When comparing the quality of Latvian statistics with other European countries, assessments ("1" for higher quality, "2" for equal, "3" for lower quality) for different statistics sectors were given only by a minor part (13 % - 33 %) of institutions participating in the survey (or 9 - 22 respondents). It is to be noted that in comment field for this question particular respondents also stated that they do not use the statistical data of other countries thus they cannot give any assessment.

Generally in comparison with other European countries the quality of demographic statistics and employment statistics was valued higher – in these sectors the assessment average values were respectively 1.86 and 1.95 (on a three-point scale, where "1" means higher quality, "2" – equal, "3"- lower quality). It is to be noted that upon assessment of the general quality of Latvian statistics, the quality of demographic statistics was the highest valued (see chapter 2.1.).

The average value of assessments of several statistics sectors is "2.00" – for foreign trade statistics, and the agricultural and environmental and business statistics in total.

Comparatively more critical assessment was given for such sectors as price statistics (2.05), income and living conditions statistics (2.06), public finance statistics (2.10) and national accounts statistics (2.29).

It is to be noted that 3 respondents mentioned also other statistics sectors: information society statistics (score "3"), cultural statistics (score "1") and health statistics (score "1").

Table 7. Different statistical sectors' data quality assessment in comparison with other European countries

How do you evaluate quality of Latvian statistics in comparison with other European countries? (Scores: "1" for higher quality, "2" for similar, "3" for lower quality)

	Average value	N
Demographic statistics	1.86	21
Employment statistics	1.95	22
Foreign trade statistics	2.00	14
Agricultural and environmental statistics	2.00	9
Business statistics	2.00	15
Construction statistics	*1.83*	*12*
Industrial and energy industry statistics	*2.00*	*14*
Trade and services statistics	*2.00*	*12*
Tourism and transport statistics	*2.09*	*11*
Price statistics	2.05	19
Income and living conditions statistics	2.06	18
Public finance statistics	2.10	10
National accounts statistics	2.29	14
Other statistics (including: information society statistics, cultural statistics, regional statistics, health statistics, other financial mediators statistics (each of the above was mentioned once))	1.67	3

Statistically significant differences can be observed in the quality assessment of the statistical data of different statistics sectors in comparison with other countries made by state and municipal, and private data users.

Data users of state and municipal institutions considerably higher than the private sector data users evaluate construction statistics data in comparison with the statistics of other countries (1.50, n=4 and 2.00, n=7).

The comparative assessment of data quality differs also according to the information use purposes: date users utilising data for scientific purposes slightly lower evaluated the quality of national accounts statistics in comparison with other countries (2.75, n=4) than respondents not using data for scientific purposes (2.10, n=10).

Commenting upon the given assessments, several respondents stated that in Lithuania and Estonia more information is available, besides, faster and free of charge (data that has to be ordered in Latvia in advance, are available in these countries immediately). When characterising the situation in particular sectors, respondents mentioned that the price statistics is more detailed in Statistics Lithuania, while Statistics Estonia provides more detailed national accounts statistics, and foreign trade statistics cannot even be compared with Estonia and Lithuania).

Several respondents also mentioned in comments that they do not use the statistical data of other countries, thus they cannot give assessment on the quality of the Latvian statistical data in comparison with other European countries. Several respondents compared the Latvian statistical data with the Eurostat data indicating that the Latvian

data are available much sooner, faster, while the Eurostat data are better organised, more convenient to select and summarise.

2.3. Assessment of statistical data methodology

The assessment of statistical data methodology for different sectors was given by 24 % - 54 % of survey participants (or 16 - 36 institutions).

Providing answers to the question "***Is, according to your opinion, the methodology of the state statistical data appropriate and accurately developed?"*** on a scale, where "1" stands for "Yes", "2" for "In part" and "3" stands for "No", in general respondents gave the highest assessment to the methodology of demographic statistics: the average assessment value of the methodology of this sector is 1.25.

The result is slightly lower for public finance statistics (average value – 1.39) and national accounts statistics (1.42) sectors.

The average values of the methodology assessment of other statistics sectors is also below 2: employment statistics (1.50), the price statistics (1.52), income and living conditions statistics (1.67), agricultural and environmental statistics (1.69), foreign trade statistics (1.74) and business statistics (1.74).

In general 4 respondents mentioned statistics of a different sector – the information society statistics, the health statistics, the regional statistics and the cultural statistics (methodology of the regional statistics was assessed with "3", other methodologies – with "2").

Table 8. Assessment of statistical data methodology of different sectors

Is, according to your opinion, the methodology of the state statistical data appropriate and accurately developed? (Score "1" stands for "Yes", "2" for "In part", "3"stands for "No")

	Average value	N
Demographics statistics	1.25	36
Public finance statistics	1.39	18
National accounts statistics	1.42	19
Employment statistics	1.50	36
Price statistics	1.52	31
Income and living conditions statistics	1.67	33
Agricultural and environmental statistics	1.69	16
Foreign trade statistics	1.74	23
Business statistics	1.74	19
Construction statistics	*1.64*	*22*
Industrial and energy industry statistics	*1.57*	*21*
Trade and services statistics	*1.70*	*20*
Tourism and transport statistics	*1.68*	*19*
Other statistics (including: information society statistics, cultural statistics, regional statistics, health statistics, other financial mediators statistics (each of the above was mentioned once))	2.25	4

In the quality assessment of statistical data methodology statistically significant differences are not observed by state and municipal, and private data users, but in the same assessment statistically significant differences can be observed in the purposes of use of the statistical information.

When characterising the quality of foreign trade statistics methodology, data users utilising this data for the scientific research evaluated it slightly lower (2.17, n=6) in comparison with respondents not using data for such purposes (1.59, n=17). In their turn, data users utilising data for the analysis of trends and long-term policy formulation, evaluated the quality of foreign trade statistics methodology higher (1.53, n=15) than respondents not using data for such purposes (2.13, n=8).

Respondents using data for the analysis of trends and long-term policy formulation evaluated the quality of construction statistics methodology lower (1.81, n=16) in comparison with respondents not using data for such purposes (1.17, n=6). Similarly the quality of employment statistics methodology was assessed lower by data users utilising this data for econometric modelling and forecasting (1.88, n=8) than respondents not using data for these purposes (1.39, n=28). It is possible that these users have higher demands towards the methodology of data acquisition.

One fourth of all institutions (or 17 respondents) used the possibility to comment on the given assessment for methodology. Some customers stated that methodology in all sectors is appropriate or that information available is insufficient and they did not study methodology descriptions deep enough to give more specific assessments.

Separate comments on particular sectors were as follows:

- ✓ Income and living conditions statistics – "*it is necessary to consider full subsistence minimum or eliminate this indicator alltogether. Its appearance in the public domain causes biased understanding on the part of the society on the situation in the country"; "the income statistics do not reveal the actual situation in the country"; "to include in the household budget information on reserves and their use, as well as on credit liabilities".*
- ✓ National accounts statistics – *"The methodology of the annual financial accounts (AFA) is insufficiently understood and researched, its elaboration is not complete"; "investment summarising – to balance quarterly and annual samples, this refers also to other indicators".*
- ✓ Public finance statistics – *"The methodology of the public financial statistics (PFS) is insufficiently understood and developed, its elaboration is not complete"; "in the financial statistics the division units of fields are too broad, comparison with other Baltic States is impossible".*
- ✓ Employment statistics – *"it is complicated to find data by public and private sectors as well as state and municipal sectors"; "data differs considerably from the SEA data"; "unemployment statistics are missing in relation to the respondent's knowledge of the official language".*
- ✓ Demographic statistics – *"information on tourism statistics is missing; inspections of tourist flow are not accurate enough".*
- ✓ Construction statistics – *"total number of constructed sq m and apartments is mentioned, but the total number of constructed buildings is missing".*
- ✓ Price statistics – *"consumer basket is to be changed".*
- ✓ Foreign trade statistics – *"do not reveal changes in prices by textile goods categories".*

Respondents also gave general comments on the methodology and availability of the statistical data, stating that the problem is *"unavailability of data due to*

confidentiality or other reasons. Very often even two thirds of specially prepared data are unavailable, due to the fact that in respective columns there are few or concentrated companies that make an analysis impossible". It was also mentioned that *"sector analysis according to the NACE classification results in delusion in development tendencies".* A respondent indicated problems related with recalculations of data: *"sometimes in statistical yearbooks data recalculations are carried out for previous periods. Due to the fact that reason for recalculation is not explained, use of data is burdened and doubt occurs on choice of data to be used for example for situation analysis".*

3. Compliance of information publication with needs of data users

In order to characterise the quality of CSB work it is important to understand, how data users assess organisation of the statistical data and methodological information publication, information availability and compliance of the published information with their needs.

3.1. Compliance of data publication organisation with users' needs

Publication of the statistical data within the CSB is provided in the data dissemination calendar. Answering the question "***Are you aware of a freely available calendar of data releases detailing advance information on dates of publications of statistical data?"***, two thirds of the surveyed institutions (45 institutions or 67 % stated that they are informed on existence of such calendar; one third of the surveyed institutions (20 institutions or 30 %) were not aware of existence of such calendar but 2 institutions did not answer this question.

There are no differences in awareness of state and municipal institutions and private institutions, however, statistically significant relationship can be observed between awareness on data publication and data use purposes: data users stating that information is used for educational purposes, more often indicated that they are not informed on existence the calendar of data releases (46 %). It is possible that users do not utilise information for these purposes on a regular basis.

Statistically significant relationship can be observed between the data sources used and awareness on existence of the calendar of data releases. Institutions using the CSB press releases more often stated that they are aware of existence of such calendar (86 %) as are institutions using publications/Web sites and public databases of the EU institutions (e.g. Eurostat) (78 %).

Customers were asked to express their opinion on the appropriateness and accuracy of the calendar of data releases: "***Do, according to your experience, data publications coincide with the scheduled dates of publications?"*** One third of the surveyed (26 institutions or 39 %) revealed their experience that data is usually published on the scheduled dates; approximately equal number of customers (29 institutions or 43 %) were not aware of the calendar appropriateness or had not paid attentions to it. Only approximately one tenth of the surveyed institutions (6 institutions or 9 %) stated that data are not always published on the scheduled dates. Out of all institutions 5 did not answer the question.

When characterising the accuracy of the data releases calendar, out of all respondents 8 provided comments. Comments of 4 institutions revealed that these institutions do not regard it significant to follow the information of the calendar: "*I do not follow the calendar, if there are data, they are there, if there are no data, they are not there".*

Customers also stated that it is not important to stick to the calendar, but sooner data publication should be ensured: *"It is great that the scheduled dates are observed. It facilitates belief in promises. But it is not crucial for company's activities in general. It is more important to publish as fast as possible, but not as promised".*

The same significance is given to update databases after publication of press releases: "*Very rarely new data can be found in the CSB databases immediately after press releases being published. It would be much better if together with the press release data would appear also in databases due to the fact that not always all the necessary information can be found in press releases".*

Nevertheless some specific cases were noticed, when the calendar was not abided: "*But sometimes publication of, e.g. a yearbook is delayed".*

When characterising the organisation of data publication, information on data recalculations for previous periods and organisation of updated data publications is significant. Respondents were asked the following question: "***Does the available information on changes in previously published official statistical data is sufficient for you?"*** One fifth of respondents (13 respondents or 19 %) stated that information is sufficient, one third of respondents (26 respondents or 39 %) considered that information on recalculations is insufficient, 24 customers or 36 % did not have an opinion on this matter, and 4 respondents did not answer the question.

There are no statistically significant differences in satisfaction with information on data recalculations of main groups of data users according to the type of institution and data usage purposes.

When commenting on publication of data recalculations, 13 institutions rendered different opinions. Out of all institutions 5 stated that such information on recalculations is not necessary for them due to different reasons, for example: *"This is not a topical issue due to the fact that, when data are included in particular research or analysis, changes to it are not topical except for cases, when the whole work is updated, which is rare. Thus the topicality and contents of data are the most important features".*

Out of all institutions 6 stated in their comments that information on recalculations is not received or is unavailable, or is incomplete. For example, a customer does not know where to find such information: "*Is this special information in a form of separate report or only as notes to tables? If it is about separate information, I do not know (personally me), where it can be found".*

Similarly not always after recalculations the available information is sufficient: *"The statistical data are often changed and corrected, but there is no information on the previously announced result, thus it is very common that data of different periods are compared".*

When pointing at changes in particular statistics sector, respondents in their comments reveal their dissatisfaction on too frequent changes in data and too frequent recalculations: "*The data on export/import changes constantly and not always it is possible to follow, where the last data can be found and what was changed".*

Organisation of data publication is significantly characterised by customers' satisfaction with timeliness of the data publications and its compliance with needs of data users. Respondents were asked the question ***"Do you consider that the statistical data are published timely in compliance with your needs?"*** requesting to assess each statistics sector on a three-point scale ("1" stands for "Yes", "2" for "In part", "3" for "No"). Out of all institutions 19 or 28 % provided their comments.

Upon assessment of timeliness of separate statistics sectors, different statistics sectors were assessed by 15 to 42 respondents or 22 % to 63 % of the surveyed. It is to be

stated that in general respondents comparatively highly evaluate timeliness of the data publication: score "1" or "Yes" to different statistics sectors was given by 35 % to 82 % of the surveyed, while score "3" or "No" for the data publication time-wise compliance was given by 3 % - 24 % of the surveyed.

In comments characterizing **the general data timeliness,** respondents were quite critical: *"Actually the statistical data are outdated at the moment of their publication…"* Respondents express willingness to receive data sooner, but are aware of the fact that data summarising for publication is a time-consuming work: *"I would like to see the published data sooner, but I understand that their summarising is time-consuming".* Respondents in their commentaries also express understanding of different factors delaying timely data publications: *"Information providers, the primary sources, are not interested in providing accurate and timely information and do it carelessly. This, in its turn, hampers obtainingobjective and timely information".*

In order to deal with problems related with the data timeliness, one of suggestions is to publish provisional data estimates before final results: *"The CSB data are available 1.5 to 2 years late. This is regrettable in a situation when majority of economic indices change if not monthly, then quarterly for sure. The CSB should make data available sooner and publish data even if it is only provisional estimate".*

Respondents acknowledged that the timeliness of the price statistics is the most appropriate: 82 % of 38 institutions assessed it as appropriate, 16 % as partially appropriate and only 3 % as inappropriate. The average assessment of the data publication timeliness for price statistics is 1.21, which is the highest average assessment, and the assessment of the timeliness of price statistics has the lowest value of the standard deviation, which means that respondents in their assessment were rather in concord.

The next highest assessed sectors in terms of the data publication timeliness are demographic statistics and public finance statistics.

Out of 41 respondents 61 % are completely satisfied with timeliness of demographic statistics, 29 % are partially satisfied, and 10 % are unsatisfied. The average assessment is 1.49. Although in general the respondents are satisfied with demographic statistics, there is one negative comment: *"Data on population structure (demographic data) is actually very outdated".*

Out of 20 respondents 60 % are completely satisfied with timeliness of public finance statistics, 30 % are partially satisfied, and 10 % are unsatisfied. Like in the timeliness assessment of demographic statistics, the average assessment of public finance statistics is 1.50.

Timeliness of the macroeconomic data in comparison with the microeconomic data in general is assessed positively: *"It is significant that the CSB managed to improve timeliness for range of data, but unfortunately majority of this data is suitable only for the analysis of the macro economy, which is not very topical except for the Bank of Latvia".*

Nonetheless comments on public finance statistics data not always are positive: *"For a long period of time AFA preparation deadlines stipulated by the Eurostat are not observed thus loosing data topicality. Adhering to present ECB requirements in the statistics of other financial mediators, timeliness is sufficient".*

Foreign trade statistics data assessment is slightly lower: 1.66, however only 45 % of 29 institutions, having evaluated timeliness of this statistical data, stated that it completely complies with needs and 45 % of institutions stated that it complies partially. Also in comments about foreign trade statistics respondents expressed willingness to receive data sooner: "*The foreign trade: data could be published earlier, but I guess it is not easy".*

When characterising national accounts statistics, 46 % or 24 respondents were of the opinion that data timeliness complies with needs of institutions, but 17 % considered that it does not comply. The average assessment is 1.71. However, in comments comparing timeliness of national accounts statistics with situation in other countries, respondents were more critical:

> "*In other EU member states complete national accounts statistics is available considerably sooner (data on the year 2005 is already available there, but not in Latvia)".*
>
> *„As at 6 February this year the statistical data for the previous years are still not available although they have already been prepared. Also inspections with more detailed information are published in the middle of the year, when information is practically 6 months old already. The data on the gross domestic product are updated thus its use is made more difficult. Data summarization and processing speed causes situation, when the last data available in publications on the Internet is at least one year old and the real situation since then has changed considerably. This leaves impact on accuracy of short-term forecasts".*
>
> *„The GDP by district towns and cities are published with a two-year displacement. In the January 2007 data on 2004 was published. In the report of the year 2006 of the Ministry of Economy the GDP data of the year 2003 with district division is analysed due to the fact that data on recent years are not available".*
>
> *„The GDP by city, for example, is available with a two-year delay. The statistical data is used in implementation and elaboration of projects for investment attraction for city development, thus the degree of detail in city section is necessary and very often even by sectors of national economy".*

The timeliness of agricultural and environmental statistics was assessed by 15 respondents and the average assessment is 1.73. Income and living conditions statistics and employment statistics are slightly lower assessed (1.74). The timeliness of employment statistics publication not always complies with customers' needs: *"Publication of employment statistics according to the data release calendar is envisaged on 22 February (for 4th quarter of 2006); this information should be available approx. on 5 February (first days of a month following the month after the end of quarter)".*

The timeliness compliance of business statistics in total was assessed by 20 data users with the average assessment of 1.80. Separate fields of business statistics were assessed by more respondents and received higher assessment than business statistics in total. The highest assessment of all fields of business statistics was given to the timeliness of trade and services statistics (assessment was given by 23 respondents, the average assessment is 1.70). The timeliness of industrial and energy industry statistics was slightly lower assessed (assessment was given by 25 respondents, the

average assessment is 1.72). Construction statistics in average is assessed in the same level and business statistics in total (assessment was given by 25 respondents, the average assessment is 1.80), the timeliness of tourism and transport statistics received the lowest assessment of all sectors (assessment was given by 27 respondents, the average assessment is 1.89).

On the timeliness of business statistics such critical notes were given in comments that data is published comparatively late, which makes work more difficult:

> "*Publication of the statistical data is done very late. For example, construction data for the year 2005, which is very necessary for my work, at present are not available".*
>
> *"Majority of business statistics in all fields necessary for situation analysis in the market (for example, turnover of companies) is available approximately one year after the period, on which the data is revealed. It would be advisable that the data are available within 6 months".*
>
> *"The transport statistics are published irregularly (for example, data on railroad is published for the 2nd quarter and then only for the year). On the Web site of the company Latvijas Dzelzceļš this information is available much sooner".*

In comments emphasis on the timeliness of data is put in sectors, which are used for work planning by data users on a daily basis: "*Much more attention should be paid to the timeliness of macroeconomic indicators, labour market and export indicators and other specific indicators due to the fact that these are more significant both for specific policy and business".*

Timeliness assessment for other types of statistics (information society, culture statistics, regional statistics) was given by 3 respondents and the respective assessments were as follows: the regional statistics - "3", the information society statistics - "2" and the culture statistics - "1".

Table 9. Satisfaction with timeliness of statistical data publication

Do you consider that the statistical data are timely published in compliance with your needs? (Scores: "1" stands for "Yes", "2" for "In part", "3" for "No")

	Average value	N
Price statistics	1.21	38
Demographic statistics	1.49	41
Public finance statistics	1.50	20
Foreign trade statistics	1.66	29
National accounts statistics	1.71	24
Agricultural and environmental statistics	1.73	15
Income and living conditions statistics	1.74	42
Employment statistics	1.74	42
Business statistics	1.80	20
Trade and services statistics	*1.70*	*23*
Industrial and energy industry statistics	*1.72*	*25*
Construction statistics	*1.80*	*25*
Tourism and transport statistics	*1.89*	*27*
Other statistics (information society statistics, culture statistics, regional statistics (each of the above was mentioned once))	2.00	3

There are no differences in assessment depending on whether the respondent stated that this data is or is not used on a regular basis. Statistically significant differences can be observed in division of timeliness assessment by the type of respondent institutions.

Timeliness of construction statistics was considerably higher valued by private companies (assessment was given by 12 respondents, the average assessment is 1.50 with the standard deviation of 0.67) rather than by state and municipal institutions (assessment was given by 10 respondents, the average assessment is 2.30 with the standard deviation of 0.82).

Similarly also the timeliness assessment for trade and services statistics is higher among private data users (assessment was given by 10 respondents, the average assessment is 1.40 with the standard deviation of 0.52) rather than among state and municipal institutions (assessment was given by 9 respondents, the average assessment is 2.00 with the standard deviation of 0.50).

3.2. Availability of data and explanatory information to users

Data availability - how simply and easy the data user can find the necessary data and methodological information – also characterises cooperation quality between the CSB and data users.

Respondents were asked the question ***"How do you view the accessibility of CSB statistical data? ",*** asking to characterise how available to users are the CSB's data. More than a half from 65 respondents who replied to the question assessed that data are available comparatively easy (35 or 54 %), 27 respondents or 42% indicated that access to data from the CSB requires patience, whereas 3 institutions or 5% have noted that access to CSB's data is complicated and time consuming. There are no significant differences regarding assessment of date access process within the groups of main users.

Table 10. Opinion of the accessibility of CSB data(%)

"How do you view the accessibility of CSB statistical data? "

Comparatively easy	54
Requires patience	42
Complicated and time consuming	5
N	65

18 respondents provided comments while characterising the CSB's data obtaining process.

Respondents indicate that information is available simply and easy in cases when it is clear what kind of information is needed and when it can be found at the CSB Web site or data bases*: "Positive - internet data base".*

However, if information is not in data base or Web site then the finding process becomes considerably more complicated:

> *"If the necessary data can be found in CSB data base – easy, if not – time consuming."*
>
> *"Easy to obtain data on the Internet, however availability of yearbooks, leaflets, data collections complicated/not available".*
>
> *Complicated when more specific information, unavailableon the Web site, is needed. Not all data are available in the public data base; often it is necessary to make customised queries."*

In their comments respondents also make critical remarks about the CSB's customer orientation as a service-providing institution

> "*At times delays the [data] supply time provided in the law. In those instances "they would admit that internal problems are more important than customer service. Even if so, it is not necessary to tell me that."*

Also at times "*CSB's personnel often is not welcoming*".

Respondents also indicate that services provided by the CSB quality-wise and time-wise not always correspond to the requested payment. LURSOFT is referred to as a positive example, where information is prepared fast and less expensive:

"LURSOFT, by concluding an agreement it is possible to obtain the necessary information very fast"

"Private entities have less bureaucracy; everything can be settled over the phone. A single record is too expensive (~ LVL 0.35) compared to "Lursoft"- LVL 0.10 ."

Speed of customer service and openness, flexible attitude to customer's needs are some of the suggestions for improvements made by respondents.

"In this field CSB should be more accessible. I think it is worth to guarantee, for example, date processing within 1 or 2 days from the moment of request, and not within 10 days as it is now."

"The fact that for obtaining different type of data it is necessary to contact several people does not foster successful cooperation. Especially considering that it is not an analysis, rather just a selection of data. Apparently working with the CSB for a longer time one gets used to it and take into consideration, however, it can be hardly called an orientation towards the customer."

"It is inconvenient when one has to go to the Information Office to place an order. The possibility should be considered to allow specific statistics to be ordered over the phone."

Respondents where asked the question ***"Is it easy enough to obtain statistical data using the CSB's Web site and data bases found there?"*** Most of 65 respondents replying to the question noted that data at the CSB's Web site and in data basses located there are easy to obtain - 55 or 85% respondents replied that. 7 respondents or 11% consider that obtaining data from the CSB's Web site is not easy enough, whereas 3 institutions or 5% were not able to give answer to the question. There are no statistically significant differences within the main groups of users regarding assessment of accessibility of the CSB's Web site and data bases located there.

Table 11. Assessment of the CSB's data obtaining process (%)

Is it easy enough to obtain statistical data using the CSB's Web site and data bases found there?

Yes	85
No	11
Don't know	5
N	65

In their comments respondents express satisfaction with the new structure of the CSB's Web site and information available there: *"Finding information has improved together with the new format of the Web site".*

However, respondents also have certain objections and critical remarks related with problems finding the necessary information on the new CSB's Web site:

"In the new Web site it is very complicated to find the necessary information (for example, in order to find the necessary press release from the archive, one needs to click month by month and it is not possible to go directly to, lets say, February 2006, or look at all press releases at the given section for the whole possible period). Also the key indicators were more transparent in the previous web version".

"The new Web site is inconvenient, several indicators are not published."

"The Web site does not contain data which, for example, can be found in Yearbook on Demography etc. Difficult when any more specific information is needed which is not on the Web site. Not all data are accessible in the public data base, often it is necessary to make a special order."

In total 15-33 or 21%-49% respondents have indicated their level of satisfaction with availability of methodological information. The total evaluation is relatively high: more than a half – 52%-79% of evaluators from each field gave the highest score "1" for methodological information on various sectors of statistics, whereas only 3%-17% of evaluators - the lowest value "3".

When characterising satisfaction with availability of methodological information, agricultural and environmental statistics received the highest score (14 users have evaluated, the average value - 1.29). Slightly lower scores were given to the availability of methodological information of price statistics, demographic statistics and national accounts statistics (evaluation for each field were given by accordingly 30, 38 and 20 users, each evaluated on average with 1.33).

The third highest evaluation among data users was given to commercial statistics in general (20 users have evaluated it, the average value – 1.35), although respondents have evaluated separate fields of business statistics lower than business statistics in general. Respondents have evaluated the availability of statistical methodology on tourism and transportation statistics with the average value of 1.39 (23 users have evaluated it), the average evaluation for availability of statistical methodology on trade and services is 1.43 (23 users have evaluated it), construction statistics are evaluated on average with 1.45 (20 users have evaluated it), whereas industrial and energy industry statistics received the lowest evaluation among business statistics fields (1.52, with 21 users evaluating it).

Availability of statistical methodology information on public finance statistics has received the lowest evaluation in general, which is slightly higher than statistics on industrial and energy industry - 1.5 (18 users have evaluated it)

Table 12. Satisfaction with availability of methodological information.

Question 15: Is the methodological information (explanatory remarks, methodological descriptions, definitions, classification) on statistical data which you have used easily available? ***(Score "1" – Yes, "2" – In part, "3" – No)***

	Average value	N
Agricultural and environmental statistics	1.29	14
Price statistics	1.33	30
Demographic statistics	1.33	36
National accounts statistics	1.33	21
Commercial statistics	1.35	20
Tourisms and transportation statistics	1.39	23
Trade and services statistics	1.43	23
Construction statistics	1.45	20
Industrial and energy industry statistics	1.52	21
Income and living conditions statistics	1.36	33
Foreign trade statistics	1.38	21
Employment statistics	1.42	33
Public finance statistics	1.50	18
Other statistics sectors (including: information society statistics, cultural statistics, regional statistics, health statistics, other financial mediators statistics (each of the above was mentioned once))	1.60	5

Availability of other type of statistical methodology each were evaluated by one user: health statistics evaluation with "1", information society - with "1", cultural statistics with – "1", regional statistics - with "3" and statistics on other financial intermediary (OFI) – with "2".

The data users who apply statistical data for econometric modelling evaluated availability of statistical methodology on national accounts slightly lower (1.80, 5 users have evaluated it, compared with 1.19, 16 users have evaluated it).

The data users who apply statistical data for trend analysis, formulating long-term politics, evaluated availability of statistical methodology on employment statistics slightly lower compared to those who do not user data for such purpose (1.5. 26 users have evaluated it and 1.00, 7 users have evaluated it).

In their comments respondents have provided evaluation of quality of the available methodology. Methodology in general is sufficiently expanded, however, not always easily comprehensive and available to any reader*: "In general the methodology is well described. Methodology currently contains enough information, however, it is hard to perceive"*. Information which is "*provided next to statistical tables*" is the easiest to use.

However, a data user has noted that "*at times it comes short in indicating changes in registration principles, and registration moments and review periods*."

Yet often it is not enough with the published methodology, and when advanced comprehension is needed to approach CSB's personnel:

> *"No, often it is necessary to look for additional explanation"*
>
> *"In essence methodological description is comparatively superficial – it is problematic to find more detailed and specific description (such supposedly can be obtained only directly from the CSB)"*
>
> *"Methodology is not exhaustively described, several ways of interpretation exist, not possible to get along without contacting the CSB"*

Data users must be well-educated in order to be able to be competent in methodological issues and know what is important to ask: *"If the right questions are not asked it is possible not to find out everything, although this information would be essential."* However, the CSB's personnel can assist: *"Even if information is not available, the CSB's personnel are kind enough to tell you everything, there are no problems!"*

When characterising availability of methodology on the CSB's Web site and in data bases, users have commented that the methodology is rather difficult to find or it does not contain the necessary methodological information:

> *"Data bases almost have no methodology in any area!"*
>
> *"Methodological information on AFA is not published on the CSB's Web site, whereas in the field of public finance statistics such information is not available at all."*
>
> *„Methodology was comparatively easier to find in the old* [Web site] *version."*
>
> *„Methodology is not possible to find in the new version of CSB's Web site".*

Layout of methodological information in the data base is not always logical, understandable for users and consequent, for instance, in the area of housing statistics:

"*definitions are not placed logically by sections, for example in the CSB's section - number of housing units, it is not explained what is understood by housing units, whereas there is an explanation for a housing fund."*

Data users in their comments have made also some suggestions in order to make the methodological information more available for various users who are not experts in collecting and summarizing specific type of statistics: *"Would be great to make summaries, which are readable also for non-experts. Let's say, at the beginning stating who were surveyed, how many, by questionnaires or otherwise, and that is it."*

Another suggestion is to separate methodological description in several levels, by providing short comments to tables with a link to broader descriptions: *"More often short methodological descriptions should be given next to tables, with links to broader methodological descriptions, in turn in such descriptions links to tables should be provided."*

3.3. Compliance of data dissemination to user needs

Participants of the survey were asked to assess whether the way of publishing statistical data is complying to their needs, to indicate in which areas data in CSB's data bases, Web site and publications are missing or are published in not sufficiently detailed degree, as well as indicate whether the published information on methodology is sufficiently clear and in an appropriate degree of detail.

By evaluating compliance of statistical data publishing methods to their needs, 25%-63% of surveyed institutions (or 17-42 respondents) provided evaluation for separate fields (on the scale of three points, where "1" stands for "Yes", "2" - "In part" and "3" – "No").

It shall be noted that positive evaluations ("1") in general were given more often (44%-82% of those who evaluated) rather than negative evaluations (score "3" was given by no more than 8%).

When commenting on data publication methods in general, respondents have noted that it would be necessary that the CSB's Web site, CSB's data base contained more detailed information: "*The most convenient/easiest way of publishing data is the CSB's data base, however it is far from enough with the data available in the data base, there is a necessity for more detailed information*." By characterising more specific it is indicated that "*territorial dimension is not satisfying*", there is a need "*to reflect information at least by largest cities*".

A suggestion to publish more "*bench-mark data*" is expressed: *"There is hardly anything more irritating than data given around and around, but still it is not possible to calculate what is needed. To make detailed data available, which the users can summarise or select according to own needs, there would be no need to divide numbers which are given as totals"*.

A respondent also noted that *"the new look of the CSB's Web site, in my opinion makes it difficult to use archive of press releases"*. Some details regarding layout of data publication have also been mentioned "*Often the bilingual titles of indicators seem to be inconvenient, especially when the same font and font style is used. The possibility to shadow out various columns and rows in tables as it is in data selections provided by Eurostat should be used more often, which makes it easier to grasp the numerical material, especially when it is in a small font*".

When characterising results on evaluation of specific sectors, it must be noted that the way of publishing agricultural and environmental statistics was the most approved of – the average value 1.18.

Similar evaluation was provided to such sectors as price statistics (average value: 1.35), demographical statistics (1.36) and public finance statistics (1.36). A respondent, however, has indicated in comments that "*price statistics earlier on had more information in releases*".

The way publishing statistics on income and living standard and employment statistics comply to user needs was evaluated slightly lower (the average value of evaluations accordingly were 1.39 and 1.41).

The average evaluation value for the way business statistics are published is 1.50. In this sector there is a difference in evaluation among various sectors: respondents have

given a slightly higher evaluation when evaluating the way how the publishing tourism and transportation statistics complies to their needs (average value: 1.39), comparatively lower evaluation is provided for construction statistics (1.56), trade and services statistics (1.56) and industrial and energy industry statistics (1.58).

Comments on business statistics in general shows that "*data on business by gender is not summarized, for instance – on private merchants divided by sectors and genders, as well as on owners of recently founded companies by gender",* as well as that *"the published data show the average "temperature" in the sector. It is possible to discuss development opportunities of the sector only after analysing data of each company in a long term. We are forced to process the published data according to our own programmes*". Regarding publication of tourism statistics it is mentioned that "*information on number of tourists' border-crossing is not available, which would permit to make an accurate assessment on tourism turnover with a specific country".*

Comparatively less approval is shown when evaluating the way how the publication of national accounts statistics and foreign trade statistics corresponds to user needs (the average values accordingly are 1.56 and 1.61). The respondents have also commented the way of publishing statistics in these sectors: on national accounts statistics it is indicated that it "*lacks more detailed elaboration*" and that it would be necessary to publish AFA on the CSB's Web site, whereas on foreign trade statistics it is mentioned that in this sector "*it fails to show total data for all months (for example – Jan. – July)"* and "*press release could include comparison with the same period of the previous year (increase by products, countries)",*

Altogether 4 respondents also evaluated how the way of publishing of other type of statistics comply with their needs - statistics on information society and health statistics received evaluation "1", whereas cultural statistics and regional statistics received evaluation "2".

Table 13. Way of publishing statistical data. Compliance to user needs

Does the way statistical data are published correspond to your needs? (Score "1" – Yes, "2" – In part, "3" – No)

	Average value	**N**
Agricultural and environmental statistics	1.18	17
Price statistics	1.35	37
Demographical statistics	1.36	42
Public finance statistics	1.36	22
Income and living conditions statistics	1.39	41
Employment statistics	1.41	39
Business statistics	1.50	20
Construction statistics	*1.56*	*25*
Industrial and energy industry statistics	*1.58*	*26*
Trade and services statistics	*1.56*	*27*
Tourism and transportation statistics	*1.39*	*28*
National accounts statistics	1.56	25
Foreign trade statistics	1.61	28
Other type of statistics (incl. information society statistics, culture statistics, health statistics, regional statistics (each mentioned once)).	1.50	4

Respondents who use data for analysing current situation, short-term planning provide a slightly higher evaluation regarding compliance of published foreign trade statistics

to their needs (respectively 1.52, 25 users have evaluated it, compared with 1.60 average evaluation, the difference is statistically important).

Respondents who use data for econometric modelling and forecasting provide a slightly lower evaluation regarding compliance of publishing statistics on income and living conditions (1.170, 10 users have evaluated it, compared with 1.29 in total) and employment statistics to their needs (1.80. 10 users have evaluated it, compared with 1.28 in total). It should be added that also in general users of such data are more critical to quality of publishing data and methodology.

Respondents who use data for scientific research provide a lower evaluation regarding compliance of publishing data on foreign trade statistics (average value 2.00, 10 have evaluated it, compared with an average of 1.61 in total) and national accounts statistics (average value 2.00, 7 have evaluated it, compared with 1.56 on average in total) to their needs. There are no significant differences within other groups regarding evaluation of data compliance.

By responding to question on the degree of detail for statistical data published in the CSB's data bases and Web site, less than a half of respondents gave evaluation by separate sectors (16%-46% or 11-33 respondents).

It must be noted that by mentioned sector 6%-57% gave evaluation "1" – "*yes, degree of data detailed elaboration does not correspond*", and 25% - 75% of institutions providing evaluation marked answer "2" - degree of detail in part does not correspond to user needs.

When commenting on the degree of detail of the published data in general, institutions noted that the degree of detail by territorial units is not satisfying, for example, "*the CSB's data base mainly publishes data about Latvia in general, therefore degree of detail does not comply with my needs. My work requires detailed information regarding Riga*", "*degree of detail - by perspective of republic (cities) and national economy by territories of local governments*", "*I am interested in data distribution by the largest cities. However, at the moment important data by cities are not available, like for instance, the average gross salary, foreign investments, industry sectors, structure of national economy etc.*".

It has also been mentioned that *"basic information is not available soon enough on the Web site*", as well as a fact that "*it would be useful to add to all sections data on earlier periods than 2002-2000 (e.g., distribution of the GDP).*

When characterising situation in separate sectors, it should be noted that most often it is mentioned that the degree of detail is not sufficient for national accounts statistics (score "1" – "*yes, the degree of detail does not comply*" was given by 57%, additional 38% gave the answer "2" – "*in part*".) In their comments respondents have indicated that "*Web site does not contain tables on complete national accounts*", "*national accounts statistics could have increased degree of detail regarding components forming the GDP*" and "*very limited number of indicators of national accounts is published in due time*".

Also when evaluating price statistics and public finance statistics, more than 90% of institution which gave evaluation noted a problem regarding degree of detail of such data: for price statistics 50% checked the answer "*yes*" and 42% - answer "*in part*", whereas on public finance statistics 46% mentioned the answer "*yes*" and 46% - answer "*in part*".

Comments on price statistics show that this sector needs data "*on more detailed price groups and by years"*, as well as that "*weights and their history is not always obtainable*".

When evaluating demographical statistics, 44% of respondents responded that the degree of detail does not comply with their needs, and 44% also mentioned that is "in part" inadequate. The comments show that "*the issue on demography lacks description by indicator",* as well as it is necessary to have "*balance of internal long-term migration in the regional perspective*".

43% admitted that the degree of detail on foreign trade statistics is not adequate, and additional 42% indicated that it is "*in part*" inadequate. Respondents have commented that it is necessary to have more detailed distribution, for example, "*distribution by countries and by year*", "*desirable also to have distribution by countries and goods simultaneously*", "*there is no such distribution as: by country export-re-export*.". It is also indicated that the classifications used are not compatible.

39% respondents mentioned that the degree of detail on employment statistics in the CSB's data bases, Web site and publications is not adequate, and another 58% indicated that it is "*in part*" inadequate. In their comments institutions have indicated that "*employment statistics do not reflect the actual number of employed persons in the sector"*, an opinion also has been expressed that it is necessary to have more detailed data regarding survey of labour force "*in order to guarantee the possibility to receive information on employment situation for groups of people subject to risk of social exclusion and obtain information on employment of inhabitants at least on the regional level*", and it is mentioned that "*there is no adequate data on employment level within the age group of 55-64. Data on number by age groups is not distributed the same as in publications*" and it is necessary to have "*indicators by regions, number of self-employed persons among the total number of employed; economically active persons within the age group of 15-64 by regions*".

33% of respondents considered the degree of detail on agricultural and environmental statistics as inadequate, and 33% of respondents who gave evaluation also indicated that its degree of detail "*in part*" does not correspond to their needs.

28% of the respondents expressed the opinion that the degree of detail on income and living standard statistics is not adequate, and another 55% noted that it "*in part*" does not correspond to user needs. When characterising problems in this sector, respondents have mentioned that "*income does not reflect the real situation*", data in this field "*are out of date, do not reflect the actual situation*", they are "*rather "ancient", which provides little help for researching the current situation".* It is also noted that "*since makeover of the CSB's Web site the indicators, values and definitions on poverty and social exclusion are not available in Latvian anymore. Access to Eurostat data bases is complicated for a non-specialist, moreover, it does not contain detailed information*". A suggestion has been expresses that "*it would be useful that information on salaries on specific profession would be available in the sector (not only within the basic groups of Latvian Profession Classification) perspective*".

Evaluating business statistics in general, 6% of respondents indicated that the degree of detail of published data in this sector is not adequate to their needs, and 75% noted that it is "*in part*" inadequate. In comments it was mentioned that "*the degree of detail of publishing business statistics is not sufficient to fulfil tasks of our institution – there is a need for more detailed distribution according to NACE classification"*.

26% mentioned that the degree of detail on construction statistics is not adequate, and 58% evaluated it as "*in part*" inadequate. It is mentioned that in this sector "*not all data are available – by years, by number of objects etc."* and "*it would be required also to have comparative data at least within the Baltic state level, yet preferably also within the EU country level in general*".

64% of respondents considered the degree of detailed data elaboration on tourism and transportation statistics as inadequate, 67% - as "*in part*" inadequate. 23% indicated that the degree of detailed data on both industrial and energy industry statistics and trade and services statistics is inadequate, and 68% - that it is "*in part*" inadequate. In comments on industry statistics it is said that "*by publishing monthly industry data it is desirable to attach the accumulative data. Respectively, by publishing, for instance, data on November, it is necessary to see data also about 11 months. Currently it is not available as said on the Web site"*.

4 respondents mentioned and evaluated other type of statistics – mentioned were health statistics and the degree of detail of its published data was assessed as adequate (in comments a respondents has explained that "*I do not consider that the CSB's Web site should contain detailed data on health care, it provides sufficient overview, however, in everyday use I need them, for example, number of doctors in particular specialization in particular hospitals. Then I use services provided by Health Statistics and Medical Technologies State Agency or Health Compulsory Insurance State Agency*"); statistics on information society evaluated as "*in part*" inadequate, whereas statistics on culture and regional statistics evaluated as inadequate (comments show that "*there are not statistical data on culture in the CSB's Web site*" and "*the range of regional statistics, speed of calculation as well as the quality of offered data is unsatisfying*").

Table 14. Evaluating the degree of detail of the published statistical data

In which fields of statistics data are not published in the CSB's data bases, Web site and publications or where its degree of detail is not adequate to your needs? ***(Evaluations by each field: "1" – Yes, "2" – In part, "3" – No)***

	Yes, degree of detail is not adequate (%)	**In part(%)**	**No (%)**	**N**
National accounts statistics	57	38	5	21
Price statistics	50	42	8	24
Public finance statistics	46	46	9	11
Demographical statistics	44	44	12	25
Foreign trade statistics	43	52	5	21
Employment statistics	39	58	3	31
Agricultural and environmental statistics	33	33	33	15
Income and living conditions statistics	28	55	17	29
Business statistics	6	75	19	16
Construction statistics	*26*	*58*	*16*	*19*
Industrial and energy industry statistics	*23*	*68*	*9*	*22*
Trade and services statistics	*23*	*68*	*9*	*22*
Tourism and transportation statistics	*24*	*67*	*10*	*21*
Other type of statistics (incl. information society, culture statistics, health statistics, regional statistics (each mentioned once)).	50	25	25	4

21%-54% of institutions (or 14-36) respondents provided evaluation on the 3-point scale in separate sectors on comprehensibility of methodologies of the published information and degree of detail (where “1” stands for “Yes” - information is clear and in adequate level of elaboration, “2” stands for “In part” and “3" for “No”).

In general, positive evaluations were given more often than the negative ones: responses “1” were given by 50% - 75%, whereas responses “3” were given by less than 7% from all those respondents who provided evaluation. Several institutions commented on methodological information in general, by indicating that "*methodologies are detailed, however, often hard to comprehend*" and "*when the methodology is showed, then it is clear. Not always the whole necessary methodology is showed*". A suggestion is also made to “*introduce explanatory section or help option in the Web site*”.

The most positive evaluations were given to information on methodology in the field of public finance statistics (average value 1.31), demographical statistics (1.36) and business statistics in general (1.38).

Evaluation of comprehensibility of methodological information in individual sectors of business statistics is slightly more critical: industrial and energy industry statistics 1.43, tourism and transportation statistics 1.43, trade and services statistics 1.45, construction statistics 1.48.

Characterizing comprehensibility of methodological information and degree of detail in employment statistics, the average evaluation value is 1.41, and 1.43 in agricultural and environmental statistics.

Comparatively more critical evaluation is given in such sectors as statistics on income and living conditions (1.49), price statistics (1.50), foreign trade statistics (1.52) and national accounts statistics (1.53).

4 respondents have mentioned other type of statistics, and it should be noted that statistics on information society, culture statistics and health statistics are evaluated with "1" (i.e. information on methodology is clear and in adequate degree of detail), whereas statistics on OFI with evaluation "2" ("*in part*").

Problems regarding correspondence of the degree of detail on publishing demographical statistics more often were considered by those data users, who have mentioned that data are used for analysing the current situation, short-term planning (46% out of 24, whereas no one from those who do not use data for such purposes had indicated a problem), trend analysis, formulation of long-term policies (46% out of 24 had pointed to problems, whereas no one from those who do not use data for such purposes had indicated a problem), but respondents who use data for scientific research have in fewer cases pointed to problems with degree of detail regarding data publishing (11% out of 9 users who use data for such purposes, and 63% out of 16 users of demographical statistics which do not use data for scientific research).

Table 15. Comprehensibility of methodologies of the published information and degree of detail

Is the information on methodology mentioned above clear enough and in adequate degree of detail? (Score "1"- Yes, "2" – In part, "3"- No)

	Average value	N
Public finance statistics	1.31	16
Demographical statistics	1.36	36
Business statistics	1.38	21
Construction statistics	1.48	21
Industrial and energy industry statistics	1.43	21
Trade and services statistics	1.45	20
Tourism and transportation statistics	1.43	21
Employment statistics	1.41	34
Agricultural and environmental statistics	1.43	14
Income and living conditions statistics	1.49	35
Price statistics	1.50	28
Foreign trade statistics	1.52	21
National accounts statistics	1.53	17
Other type of statistics (incl. information society, culture statistics, health statistics, regional statistics (each mentioned once)).	1.25	4

Data users in private sector more positively than in average have evaluated comprehensibility of the published methodological information and degree of detail in such fields as agricultural and environmental statistics (1.00, 5 users have evaluated it, compared with 1.42 in total), employment statistics (1.18, 10 users have evaluated it, compared with 1.43 in total), construction statistics (1.13, 8 users have evaluated it, compared with 1.44 in total), and tourism and transportation statistics (1.13, 8 users have evaluated it, compared with 1.42 in total).

Statistically significant differences in evaluations regarding comprehensibility of the published methodological information and degree of detail can be observed also according to purposes for data use. Data users who use data for trend analysis, formulation of long-term policies have given slightly lower evaluation for comprehensibility of the methodological information in the sector of employment statistics (the average evaluation in this group is 1.52, 27 users have evaluated it, compared with 1.41 in total). Whereas data users who use data for econometric modelling and forecasting have given slightly higher evaluation than the average for comprehensibility of the methodological information in the fields of agricultural and environmental statistics (the average evaluation in this group is 1.00, 4 users have evaluated it, compared with 1.43 in total).

4. Conclusions

In January and February 2006 CSB customer survey was carried out in order to ascertain information on users of CSB's information and their evaluation on how statistical data and methodological information and publishing of information correspond to their needs.

Characteristics of CSB's information users

Among the 67 institutions surveyed, the most frequently used sector of statistics is business statistics. 73% of surveyed institutions regularly use various sectors of business statistics: half of surveyed institutions have indication that they use trade and service statistics (51%) and tourism and transportation statistics (49%), in slightly fewer cases respondents mentioned construction (45%) and industrial and energy industry (45%) statistics. The second most frequently used sector is statistics on income and living conditions, which is regularly used by 72% of institutions.

Two thirds of the surveyed institutions also regularly use demographical statistics (69%) and employment statistics (67%), price statistics are used a little less often (61%).

Less than a half of the surveyed institutions regularly use other sectors of statistics: foreign trade statistics are regularly used by 43%, national accounts statistics - 42%, public finance statistics - 39%, agricultural and environmental statistics are regularly used by 30%.

When characterising sources of statistical data used, most often the institutions have indicated that they use CSB's Web site (85%) and various publications on statistical data (yearbooks, leaflets, data collections) (84%). Three fourth of institutions have mentioned that they use CSB's on-line data bases (75%).

In order to obtain data, 61% of institutions have used publications or Web sites and public data bases of European institutions (e.g. Eurostat), CSB's information in press releases has been used in slightly fewer cases for obtaining data (57%), as well as results of analysis and research (57%).

Less than a half of the surveyed institutions have indicated that for obtaining statistical data they use publications or Web sites of international institutions and public data bases (48%) and information published in mass media (45) (e.g. OECD, UN, IMF). One third of the surveyed institutions obtain statistical data by using CSB's customised data (tailor-made) processing services (37%).

94% of the respondent institutions have indicated that by using CSB's data they make a reference to the CSB as a source of data, whereas 1 institution does not indicate source and 4 institutions have not responded to the question.

When characterising ways how data are used, almost all the surveyed institutions (96%) use statistical data for analysing current situation, short-term planning. Three fourths (74%) use statistical data for trend analysis, formulation of long-term policies.

Little bit less than a half of the surveyed institutions use statistical data for educational purposes (42%), whereas approximately one third use data for relevant scientific research (36%) and repeated publishing of statistical data (36%). One in every five institutions surveyed use statistical data for econometric modelling and forecasting (21%).

Almost all surveyed institutions use various statistical data in international comparisons (only 8% do not). Most often institutions have indicated that in international comparisons they use employment statistics (59%), as well as demographical statistics (56%) and statistics on income and living conditions (56%). In slightly fewer cases - business statistics (55%): industrial and energy industry statistics in international comparisons use 30% of respondents, trade and services and tourism and transportation statistics - 24%, whereas construction statistics - 18% of institutions. A little more than a half of the surveyed institutions use price statistics (53%) in international comparisons.

Other sectors of statistics in international comparisons are used by less than a half: foreign trade statistics were mentioned by 44% of institutions, national accounts statistics and public finance statistics – accordingly by 44% and 38% of institutions, whereas agricultural and environmental statistics for international comparisons were used rarely by the surveyed institutions – it was mentioned by 18% of institutions.

Quality of statistical data and methodological information prepared by the CSB

Results show that in general the overall quality of statistical data is evaluated positively: on a 5-point scale (where “1” is the lowest, and “5" – the highest score) the lowest evaluations (“1” and “2”) for the mentioned sectors of statistics were given in considerably fewer cases (3%-13%) than the higher evaluations (48%-79% of respondents who gave evaluations checked responses "4" and "5").

Comparatively higher evaluations were given to the overall quality of demographical statistics and price statistic data: on a 5-point scale in the evaluation of sectors in average are accordingly 3.98 and 3.91.

Slightly lower evaluations were given to such sectors as agricultural and environmental statistics (the average value: 3.76), employment statistics (3.67), statistics on income and living conditions (3.64), public finance statistics (3.63), national accounts statistics (3.62) and foreign trade statistics (3.58).

Business statistics were in general evaluated less positively (the average value of evaluations 3.38), although evaluations for individual areas of this sector are slightly higher: the average value of evaluations for construction statistics is 3.62, tourism and transportation statistics - 3.59, trade and services statistics - 3.48, and industrial and energy industry - 3.47.

Comparing the quality of national statistics in Latvia with other European countries, in general only a small part of institutions (13%-33%) which took part in the survey gave scores (“1”- higher quality, “2” – equal, "3" – lower quality) for various sectors of statistics. It is to be mentioned that individual respondents have commented to this question that they do not use statistics of other countries, therefore they find it difficult to make an evaluation.

In general more approving evaluation of the quality of demographical statistics and employment statistics was provided, compared with other European countries – in those fields the average value of evaluation is accordingly 1.86 and 1.95. For several fields of statistics the average value of the given evaluation is “2.00” – foreign trade statistics, agricultural and environmental statistics and business statistics in general.

Comparatively more critical evaluation was provided for such sectors as price statistics (2.05), statistics on income and living conditions (2.06), public finance statistics (2.10) and national accounts statistics (2.29),

Responding to question "***Is, according to your opinion, the methodology of the state statistical data appropriate and accurately developed***?" on the scale where "1" stands for "Yes", "2" – "In part" and "3"- "No", in general the highest evaluation was given to methodology of demographical statistics: the average value of methodology in this sector is 1.25.

Only a slightly lower rate is set for fields of public finance statistics (average value - 1.39) and national accounts statistics (1.42). The average evaluation of methodology for the other mentioned fields of statistics also is lower than 2: employment statistics (1.50), price statistics (1.52), statistics on income and living conditions (1.67), agricultural and environmental statistics (1.69), foreign trade statistics (1.74) and business statistics (1.74).

Compliance of data publication with needs of data users

Two thirds of the surveyed institutions (67%) are aware of existence of data publications calendar. Institutions using information prepared by the CSB for mass media, more often have indicated that they are aware of existence of such calendar (86%), as well as institutions which in order to obtain data use publications or Web sites and public databases of European institutions (e.g.. Eurostat) (78%). One third of the surveyed (39%) indicated that their experience shows that data usually are published on the announced dates , whereas most part – 43% do not pay attention to it. Comments given by respondents confirm the same.

According to respondent evaluation, information on recalculation is not sufficient: 19% of those who have indicated that information is sufficient are satisfied, whereas one third of respondents (39%) considers that information is not sufficient for their work.

Evaluating timeliness of individual fields of statistics, 15-42 or 22%-63% of respondents evaluated various fields of statistics. It must be said that in general timeliness of data publication was evaluated rather high by respondents: score "1" – Yes – for various sectors of statistics was given by 35%-82% of surveyed, whereas score "3" – No- regarding adequacy of timeliness of data publication was given by 3%-24% of respondents.

Satisfaction with timeliness of data publication and its compliance with needs of data users was evaluated most approvingly for such sectors of statistics as price statistics (average value 1.21), demographical statistics and public finance statistics (average evaluation 1.49 and 1.50). Other sectors of statistics and timeliness of its publications as complying with needs were evaluated by less than 50% of data users.

Respondents were asked to characterize availability of CSB's data for users. More than a half of those responding to question assess that data are obtainable comparatively easy (54%), 42% assess that obtaining data from the CSB requires patience, whereas 5% have indicated that obtaining of CSB's data is complicated and time-consuming. Characterising the feasibility of obtaining information from the CSB's Web site and on-line data bases, the most part of respondents - 85% have indicated that data in the CSB's Web site and data bases therein are easy to obtain, 11% considers that availability of data from CSB's Web site is not easy enough, whereas 5% were not able to respond.

In general satisfaction with availability of methodological information was evaluated by 15-33 or 21%-49% of respondents. The total evaluation is rather high: the highest score "1" on methodological information of various sectors of statistics was given by more than a half – 52%-79% of respondents of each sector, whereas the lowest score "3" – only by 3%-17% of respondents. The highest evaluation was given to agricultural and environmental statistics (the average value - 1.29). Slightly lower is evaluation on accessibility of methodological information for price statistics, demographical statistics and national accounts statistics (each evaluated on average with 1.33). In general business statistics have received the third highest evaluation among data users (the average value – 1.35).

Participants of survey were asked to evaluate whether the way statistical data are published corresponds to their needs, to indicate in which fields the necessary data in CSB's data bases, Web site and publications are not published or are published in inadequate degree of detail, as well as indicate whether the published information on methodology is sufficiently clear and in adequate degree of detail.

25%-63% of the surveyed institutions (or 17-42 respondents) gave evaluation (on the 3 point scale, where "1" stands for "Yes", "2" – "In part" and "3" – "No") on individual sectors regarding compliance of data publication to their needs. In general positive evaluations ("1") were given comparatively more often (44%-82% by those giving evaluations) instead of negative evaluations (score '3" was given not more than by 8%). Way of publication of agricultural and environmental statistics was assessed most approvingly - the average value 1.18. Similar evaluation was given to such sectors as price statistics (the average value: 1.35), demographical statistics (1.36) and public finance statistics (1.36). Comparatively less positive assessment was given when evaluating how the way of publishing national accounts statistics and foreign trade statistics complies with user needs (the average values accordingly 1.56 and 1.61).

Inadequacy of the degree of detail most frequently is indicated regarding national accounts statistics (score "1" – "*yes, degree of detail is not adequate*" was given by 57%, more 38% marked the response "2" – "*In part*"). Also when evaluating price statistics and public finance statistics more than 90% of institutions which gave evaluation indicated problems in the degree of detail of those data: 50% marked "*Yes*" regarding price statistics, and 42% - response "*In part*", whereas 46% checked response "*Yes"* regarding public finance statistics, and 46% - response "*In part*".

The least number of inadequacies mentioned when evaluating business statistics in general, 6% of the surveyed indicated that the degree of detail of the published data in this sector is inadequate to their needs, and 75% marked that it is "*In part*" inadequate.

Evaluation on comprehensibility of methodologies of the published information and degree of detail on a 3-point scale (where "1" stands for "*yes – information is clear and in adequate level*, "2" stands for "*In part*" and "3" for "*No*") by individual sectors was given by 21% -54% of institutions (or 14-36 respondents). In general positive evaluations were given more frequently than the negative ones: response "1" was given in 50%-75%, whereas response "3" was given by less than 7% of respondents evaluating it.

The most approving evaluations on information of methodology are given in the field of public finance statistics (the average value 1.31), demographical statistics (1.36)

and in the sector of business statistics in general (1.38). Comparatively more critical evaluation is given to such sectors as statistics on income and living conditions (1.49), price statistics (1.50), foreign trade statistics (1.52) and national accounts statistics (1.53).

APPENDIX. Frequency distribution tables