

EN

026223/EU XXIV.GP
Eingelangt am 09/02/10

EN

EN



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Brussels, 9.2.2010
SEC(2010)115 final

COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT

Accompanying document to the

**Report from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on the
implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 577/98**

COM(2010)46

COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT

Accompanying document to the

Report from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 577/98

COM(2010)46

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS

1. ARTICLE 1 — FREQUENCY OF THE SURVEY

The survey shall be a continuous survey providing quarterly and annual results; however, during a transitional period not extending beyond 2002, Member States which are unable to implement a continuous survey shall instead carry out an annual survey, to take place in the spring.

By way of derogation, the transitional period shall be extended

(a) until 2003 for Italy,

(b) until 2004 for Germany under the condition that Germany provide quarterly substitute estimates for the main labour force sample survey aggregates as well as annual average estimates for some specified labour force sample survey aggregates.

By 2006, all countries except Luxembourg, Croatia, Switzerland and Turkey had adopted a continuous survey producing quarterly results. Luxembourg has provided quarterly results from 2007, whereas only annual results were available up to 2006, despite the fact that it conducted a continuous survey. Croatia moved from a semi-annual to a continuous survey producing quarterly results in 2007. Switzerland plans to adopt a continuous survey in 2010. Turkey thus remains the only country with no plan to move to a continuous survey.

Table 1. Transition to a continuous survey providing quarterly and annual results

Country	Year	Country	Year	Country	Year	Country	Year
Belgium	1999	Spain	1999	Malta	2004	Finland	2000
Bulgaria	2003	France	2003	Netherlands	2000	Sweden	1999
Czech Republic	1998	Italy	2004	Austria	2004	United Kingdom	1999q2
Denmark	1999	Cyprus	2004q2	Poland	2000	Croatia	2007
Germany	2005	Latvia	2002	Portugal	1998	Turkey	-
Estonia	2000	Lithuania	2002	Romania	1999	Iceland	2003
Ireland	1998	Luxembourg ¹	2003	Slovenia	1999	Norway	2000
Greece	1998	Hungary	1999	Slovakia	1998	Switzerland	2010
Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	2006						

¹ Until 2006, annual results only

In the case of a continuous survey

– *the reference weeks are spread uniformly throughout the whole year*

In 2007, all participating countries conducting a continuous survey except Bulgaria complied with the requirement to cover all weeks of the year.

Germany, Hungary, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Slovenia and, in 2006, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia still had the highest deviation from a uniform distribution of the reference week¹, in spite of some progress made by Luxembourg and Slovenia compared to the previous report. On the other hand, Romania has made substantial progress since 2006.

Table 2. Relative standard deviation of the weekly number of respondents (aged 15–74) and the number of reference weeks per year 2006-2007

Country	2006		2007	
	Relative standard deviation	Weeks	Relative standard deviation	Weeks
Belgium	5.9	52	6.0	52
Bulgaria	4.6	48	4.7	48
Czech Republic	1.8	52	2.5	52
Denmark	2.7	52	6.2	52
Germany	25.4	52	26.6	52
Estonia	7.7	52	7.1	52
Ireland	6.7	52	6.1	52
Greece	3.2	52	2.7	52
Spain	2.7	52	2.3	52
France	3.8	52	3.0	52
Italy	3.3	52	3.6	52
Cyprus	11.8	52	10.3	52
Latvia	8.6	52	7.5	52
Lithuania	6.1	52	10.9	52
Luxembourg	42.3	52	37.1	52
Hungary	55.9	52	69.0	52
Malta	5.9	52	6.9	52
Netherlands	27.8	52	31.4	52
Austria	5.4	52	5.7	52
Poland	2.5	52	2.6	52
Portugal	3.1	52	3.6	52
Romania	4.1	52	4.5	52
Slovenia	24.7	52	22.9	52
Slovakia	8.8	52	9.5	52
Finland	11.7	52	11.7	52
Sweden	10.0	52	10.7	52
United Kingdom	2.2	52	2.3	52
Croatia	-	-	5.9	52
Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	20.0	52	7.3	52
Turkey	-	-	-	-
Iceland	2.9	52	2.6	52
Norway	4.4	52	3.9	52
Switzerland	-	-	-	-

Note: Relative standard deviation is the standard deviation of the weekly number of respondents divided by the average number of respondents per week multiplied by 100.

Source: EU-LFS

¹ The deviation from uniform distribution of the reference week is measured by the standard deviation of the weekly number of respondents as a percentage of the average number of respondents per reference week.

- *the interview normally takes place during the week immediately following the reference week. The reference week and the date of the interview may not be more than five weeks apart, except in the third quarter*

The information on the interview week is not always provided or in some cases is not reliable and should thus be treated with caution². In five of the countries for which the information is available, namely Estonia, Italy, Malta, Austria and Portugal, less than 50% of interviews were carried out during the week immediately following the reference week. However, in 2007, at least 98% of the interviews in quarters 1, 2 and 4 were completed before the end of the 5th week after the reference week in almost all countries.

Table 3. Interview week relative to the reference week in 1st, 2nd and 4th quarters 2005-2007

Country	% interview in the next week		% interview within 5 weeks after reference period ¹	
	2006	2007	2006	2007
Belgium	50.3	50.9	100.0	100.0
Bulgaria	94.7	95.2	100.0	100.0
Czech Republic	67.4	65.3	99.0	98.5
Denmark	84.4	57.6	99.9	100.0
Germany	-	-	-	-
Estonia	33.4	34.9	99.5	100.0
Ireland	-	-	-	-
Greece	70.8	69.2	95.2	100.0
Spain	70.5	72.5	98.6	98.7
France	65.2	67.5	100.0	100.0
Italy	35.9	34.2	100.0	100.0
Cyprus	98.5	93.6	99.8	99.0
Latvia	-	87.4	-	99.6
Lithuania	81.7	80.6	100.0	100.0
Luxembourg	-	-	-	-
Hungary	-	-	-	-
Malta	22.8	23.0	100.0	100.0
Netherlands	-	-	-	-
Austria	36.2	34.6	91.0	91.3
Poland (1)	-	-	-	-
Portugal	42.8	43.3	98.8	99.4
Romania	-	-	-	-
Slovenia	-	-	-	-
Slovakia	95.3	94.2	100.0	100.0
Finland	65.0	69.0	100.0	100.0
Sweden	59.4	59.1	99.6	99.6
United Kingdom	-	-	-	-
Croatia	-	-	-	-
Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	-	-	-	-
Turkey	56.3	59.1	100.0	100.0
Iceland	82.4	61.2	100.0	100.0

² The criteria for identifying the interview week could also differ from country to country. For instance, for those sampling households, dwelling or addresses, the date recorded could be the date when the first, or the last (as in the case of Austria) or each individual member of the family has been interviewed. Alternatively, each person could be assigned the date when he is actually interviewed. The results in table 3 can thus be influenced by the approach followed by each country.

Table 3. Interview week relative to the reference week in 1st, 2nd and 4th quarters 2005-2007

Country	% interview in the next week		% interview within 5 weeks after reference period ¹	
	2006	2007	2006	2007
Norway	60.4	63.4	98.1	98.1
Switzerland	-	-	-	-

¹ Including cases where the interview is registered as the same week as the reference week.

Note: Hyphen ('-') denotes unavailable or suspect data, including the case of a 1:1 relationship between the reference week and interview week. No account is taken of non-response, which was relatively high for all years in Denmark (30 %, up from 20 % in 2005) due to postal questionnaires; in France (9 %) and Sweden (7-8 %) due to imputation of records for older workers; in Portugal (5 %) and in Norway (8 %).

(1) Although the information is not available to Eurostat, Poland reports anecdotal evidence that many of the interviews are carried out in the week following the reference week. Poland has also committed to start providing information on the interview week from 2010.

Source: EU-LFS

- *the reference weeks and years are respectively groups of 13 weeks or 52 consecutive weeks. A list of the weeks making up a given quarter or year is drawn up according to the procedure laid down in Article 8.*

Commission Regulation (EC) No 1571/98³ laid down the reference weeks for the years 1998 and 1999, and also provided derogations for Ireland and the United Kingdom to use seasonal quarters instead of calendar quarters. Since then, the reference periods have not been specified in a Commission Regulation, but have continued each year from the sequence established in 1998.

In 2006 and 2007, all countries conducting a continuous survey used the same reference period for the quarters and years, with the exception of Ireland — which used seasonal quarters instead of calendar quarters — and Iceland and the United Kingdom, where the reference period was shifted one week ahead and one week back respectively. In spite of this slight deviation, this can be considered as an improvement for the United Kingdom, where seasonal quarters had been used until 2005.

2. ARTICLE 2 — UNITS AND SCOPE OF THE SURVEY, OBSERVATION METHODS

2.1 The survey shall be carried out in each Member State in a sample of households or of persons residing in the economic territory of that State at the time of the survey.

In Denmark, Finland, Sweden, Iceland, Norway and Switzerland the final sampling unit is the person. In all the other participating countries the final sampling units are households, (clusters of) dwellings or addresses, so that information is collected for the whole household.

The definition of 'resident population' varies from one participating country to another, which may cause comparability differences, especially with regard to non-nationals and migrants. Efforts are under way to provide for a harmonised approach through the Explanatory Notes for the European Union Labour Force Survey⁴. However, the situation has not changed since

³ OJ L 205, 22.7.1998, p. 40.

⁴ The Working document 'Labour Force Survey — Revised explanatory notes (to be applied from 2008q1 onwards)' is available on request.

the previous report. There are two main approaches used in the Member States and other participating countries:

- 1) *Length of stay or intention to stay for a specified length of time.* These are either implicit in the sampling frame (rules for population registers) or in the field work. Three main benchmarks are used:
 - Spain has a filter question on the intention to stay more than one year in Spain, if a person has stayed less than one year. All those answering in the negative are excluded from the survey. Cyprus, Slovakia, Bulgaria, Croatia and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia apply the one-year rule via interviewer instructions. The population register in Finland, which forms the basis for the sampling frame, uses a similar rule for being allowed to register. Estonia, Lithuania, Sweden and Switzerland (the special sample on foreigners) also have a one-year rule for inclusion in the population registers used for the sample.
 - Denmark (EEA citizens), Iceland and Norway require registration when a stay exceeds six months. In the Romanian LFS, ‘usual residence’ is defined as a stay of at least six months.
 - Some countries require registration in the Population Registers (or a residence permit) if a stay exceeds three months (Belgium, Denmark (non-EEA citizens), Latvia, Luxembourg and Slovenia) or define ‘usual residence’ as at least three months (Poland).
- 2) *Usual residence or main residence.* In contrast, there is no time limit in the Czech Republic, Germany, Greece, France, Ireland, Italy, Hungary, the Netherlands, Austria, Portugal, the United Kingdom and Turkey, only the condition that a person’s main or usual residence is in the territory of the Participating Country.

In quarters 1, 3 and 4, France does not comply with Article 2(1), as the LFS is carried out in the Overseas Territories (DOM) in the second quarter only.⁵ Consequently, not the whole economic territory is covered in the other quarters.

2.2 The principal scope of the survey consists of persons residing in private households on the economic territory of each Member State. If possible, this main population of persons living in private households is supplemented by persons living in collective households.

Wherever possible, collective households are covered by means of samples specially drawn to permit direct observation of the persons concerned. If this is not possible, then persons in these groups who continue to have an association with a private household are included in connection with that household.

In 2006 and 2007, Denmark, Germany, Estonia, Iceland, Finland, Sweden and Norway directly surveyed persons in collective households. France, Cyprus, Romania, Bulgaria, Spain, Portugal and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia surveyed persons in collective households if they maintained connections with the sampled private household.

⁵ However, France is currently working to introduce a continuous survey as for the metropolitan departments (départements métropolitains) from 2013.

However, for Spain, Portugal and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, persons living in collective households cannot be distinguished from those in private households in the datasets sent to Eurostat. The United Kingdom used both methods for surveying persons in collective households. Some countries grossed up the LFS sample to the total population, although those living in institutional households were either not covered in the data collection (Belgium, Ireland, Latvia, Malta, Slovenia and Switzerland) or only partially covered (Bulgaria, France, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia and The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia). At the opposite, Lithuania used the population living in private households only as reference, in spite of the fact that collective households are included in the sampling frame.

Table 4. Coverage of collective households 2006-2007

No coverage	Directly	Through the sampled private household	Directly and through the sampled household
Belgium, Czech Republic, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Hungary, Malta, Netherlands, Austria, Poland, Slovenia, Croatia, Turkey, Switzerland	Denmark, Germany, Estonia, Iceland, Finland, Sweden, Norway	France, Cyprus ¹ , Romania, Bulgaria, Spain ² , Portugal ² , Slovakia, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia ²	United Kingdom

¹ Conscripts only. ² Persons living in collective households cannot be distinguished from those in private households in Eurostat's datasets.

Sources: Quality Reports, EU-LFS (HHPRIV).

2.3. The variables used to determine labour status and underemployment must be obtained by interviewing the person concerned, or, if this is not possible, another member of the household. Other information may be obtained from alternative sources, including administrative records, provided that the data obtained are of equivalent quality.

In 2006 and 2007 all the participating countries obtained information about labour status and underemployment by interview, either from the person or from another member of the household. The share of proxy interviews varied considerably across participating countries, from 0.4 % in Switzerland to nearly 60 % in Turkey. In general, the share of proxy interviews was much lower in countries sampling persons than in countries sampling households, dwelling or addresses. The share of proxy interviews remained approximately the same as in 2005 for all countries except Italy, where it more than halved from 2006. Denmark, Finland, Sweden, Iceland and Norway all make use of administrative sources, mainly for supplying information about demographic and educational characteristics.

Table 5. Share of proxy interviews (15–74 years) and use of administrative sources

	Share of proxy interviews (%)		Variables for which alternative (administrative) sources are used (2007)
	2006	2007	
Belgium	22.1	19.6	SEX, YEARBIR, DATEBIR, MARSTAT, NATIONAL, COUNTRYB, COUNTR1Y, REGION, REGION1Y, DEGURBA
Bulgaria	42.7	41.7	None
Czech Republic	47.6	46.7	None
Denmark	2.1	1.9	HHLINK, SEX, YEARBIR, DATEBIR, MARSTAT, NATIONAL, YEARESID, COUNTRYB, REGISTER, DEGURBA, HHINST, HATLEVEL, HATFIELD, HATYEAR
Germany	26.9	27.3	None
Estonia	17.7	21.6	None
Ireland	47.5	49.2	None

Table 5. Share of proxy interviews (15–74 years) and use of administrative sources

	Share of proxy interviews (%)		Variables for which alternative (administrative) sources are used (2007)
	2006	2007	
Greece	42.5	42.0	None
Spain	53.5	53.9	None
France	32.0	31.5	None
Italy	15.7	18.1	None
Cyprus	31.4	31.7	None
Latvia	38.7	38.8	None
Lithuania	45.2	43.0	SEX, YEARBIR, DATEBIR, NATIONAL, COUNTRYB
Luxembourg	52.1	53.0	-
Hungary	42.6	44.4	None
Malta	50.2	50.2	None
Netherlands	47.2	46.5	-
Austria	25.5	23.4	None
Poland	41.4	41.6	None.
Portugal	45.8	46.3	None
Romania	28.8	28.3	None
Slovenia	58.1	58.0	-
Slovakia	61.2	55.9	-
Finland	4.4	4.4	SEX, YEARBIR, DATEBIR, MARSTAT, NATIONAL, COUNTRYB, HATLEVEL, HATFIELD, HATYEAR
Sweden	2.6	2.7	SEX, YEARBIR, DATEBIR, NATIONAL, YEARESID, COUNTRYB, NACE, REGISTER, HATFIELD, HATYEAR
United Kingdom	36.0	35.7	-
Croatia	40.3	42.1	-
Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	43.0	39.8	-
Turkey	58.8	59.1	None
Iceland	1.1	1.3	SEX, YEARBIR, DATEBIR, MARSTAT, NATIONAL, COUNTRYB
Norway	14.9	15.0	SEX, YEARBIR, DATEBIR, MARSTAT, NATIONAL, YEARESID, COUNTRYB, REGISTER, COUNTRY1Y, REGION1Y, EDUCLEVEL, EDUCFIELD, HATLEVEL, HATFIELD, HATYEAR
Switzerland	0.5	0.4	-

Notes: Hyphen '-' denotes that no information is available.

Sources: EU-LFS (PROXY), Quality Reports.

2.4. Regardless of whether the sampling unit is an individual or a household, information is usually collected for all individuals of the household. However, if the sampling unit is an individual, the information concerning the other members of the household

- *may exclude the characteristics listed under Article 4(1)(g), (h), (i) and (j),*
- *and may be collected from a sub-sample defined in such a way that:*
- *the reference weeks are uniformly distributed throughout the whole year,*
- *the number of observations (individuals sampled plus the members of their household) satisfies, for the annual estimates of levels, the reliability criteria defined in Article 3.*

Denmark, Finland, Norway and Iceland all survey a sub-sample of households as stipulated by Article 2(4), while in Sweden and Switzerland the household is not covered. However, in 2006 and 2007, only Denmark and Finland delivered data to Eurostat on a sub-sample of households according to Article 2(4). In these sub-samples, Finland provided data for almost all the required characteristics and most of the optional variables, while Denmark did not

provide any information on 22 compulsory variables in 2006 and on 24 variables in 2007⁶. Denmark has committed to provide all mandatory characteristics in the household sub-sample from 2010 onwards. Sweden has committed to start supplying information on household members of selected persons from the same year, while Norway will need more time.

No information on the representativeness of the Danish and Finnish household sub-samples is available from the quality reports. However, taking into account the sample and population size and the estimated design effect for the full yearly sample, it can safely be assumed that these comply with the specification laid down in Article 2(4), fourth bullet.

3. ARTICLE 3 — REPRESENTATIVENESS OF THE SAMPLE

3.1. For a group of unemployed people representing 5% of the working age population the relative standard error for the estimation of annual averages (or for the spring estimates in the case of an annual survey in the spring) at NUTS II level shall not exceed 8% of the subpopulation in question.

Regions with less than 300 000 inhabitants shall be exempt from this requirement.

The relative standard error for the estimation of annual averages is a function of the sample size, the sampling rate, the overlap of observation units within the year and the design effect⁷. While the first three elements are known, the design effect can be computed only for actual estimates, whereas Article 3(1) refers to a theoretical situation. The following assessment is therefore based on ad hoc assumptions on theoretical design effects (see Annex II), and for this reason it shows only circumstantial evidence of deviations from the requirement. Accordingly, the assessment should not be seen as providing conclusive proofs for compliance with Article 3(1)⁸.

The assessment considers the age group 15-74 as a benchmark for the sample size and the sampling fraction, as this is the one covered by the definition of unemployment. In order to determine whether or not a region is exempt from the requirement, the total regional population is considered instead.

In the 33 countries providing data to Eurostat, there were 307 regions defined at NUTS II level in 2006 and 311 in 2007⁹. In both years, 17 regions had fewer than 300 000 inhabitants.

⁶ These variables are: MARSTAT, NATIONAL, YEARESID, STAPRO, NACE3D, ISCO4D, COUNTRYW, REGIONW, YSTARTWK, FTPT, EVENWK, NIGHTWK, SATWK, SUNWK, HWUSUAL, WISHMORE, HWWISH, HOMEWK, LOOKOJ, EXIST2J, INTWEEK, DEGURBA and, in 2007, SEEKREAS and AVAIREAS. Denmark has committed to collect and provide Eurostat with household information on a quarterly basis from the first quarter of 2010.

⁷ Although not strictly according to the definition of *design effect* (cf. Kish 1965), here it is assumed for simplicity that the effects of weighting, including the use of auxiliary variables, also contribute to the design effect.

⁸ The need for clarification of articles 3(1) and 3(2) has been highlighted by the LFS community and recognised by Eurostat. An initiative is to be launched soon to address this issue.

⁹ In 2008 the revised Nomenclature of territorial units entered into force. As the changes with respect to the previous NUTS 2003 version were known in advance, most countries implemented them already in 2007. The difference between 2006 and 2007 is partly due to the introduction of five NUTS II regions in Denmark and two in Slovenia — countries which were each previously considered as a single region. It is also due to the coverage of the NUTS II level (three regions) in Croatia — for which data were available only at national level up to 2006 — and to the merging of three NUTS II regions into one in Germany.

The benchmark is estimated to have been exceeded, either in 2006 or 2007, in 60 regions belonging to ten participating countries: Belgium (3 regions), Bulgaria (4), Germany (2), Greece (7), Spain (1), France (18), Poland (7), Portugal (2), Romania (7) and United Kingdom (9). The threshold was exceeded in both years in 35 regions in Belgium and in Bulgaria (1 region), Greece (5), France (10), Poland (5), Portugal (2), Romania (3) and the United Kingdom (8).

Table 6. Regions with 300 000 inhabitants or more, where the relative standard error (RSE) for the estimate of annual average unemployment (5%) exceeded 8% in 2006-2007

Country	Region (NUTS II)		2007 yearly sample size (15-74 years)	2007 yearly sampling rate (%) (15-74 years)	RSE 2006	RSE 2007
Belgium	BE31	Brabant wallon	4 652	1.69	8.38	8.03
	BE33	Liège	9 664	1.24	10.49	
	BE35	Namur	5 344	1.56		8.08
Bulgaria	BG31	Severozapaden	14 052	1.95	8.85	
	BG32	Severen tsentralen	12 752	1.71	10.72	12.16
	BG33	Severoiztochen	13 984	1.79		10.96
	BG34	Yugoiztochen	14 188	1.63	8.53	
Germany	DE50	Bremen	4 196	0.80		8.35
	DEB2	Trier	3 324	0.84		9.04
Greece (*)	GR11	Anatoliki Makedonia, Thraki	14 980	3.33	10.05	9.46
	GR14	Thessalia	13 056	2.36	8.55	8.36
	GR21	Ipeiros	16 236	6.28	9.80	9.90
	GR23	Dytiki Ellada	14 860	2.72		8.03
	GR24	Stereia Ellada	13 632	3.24	9.70	9.90
	GR25	Peloponnisos	15 088	3.43	8.51	8.47
	GR43	Kriti	17 664	4.06	8.73	
Spain	ES23	La Rioja	8 732	3.65	8.49	
France	FR21	Champagne-Ardenne	8 724	0.91	9.97	9.86
	FR22	Picardie	9 180	0.68	10.30	
	FR23	Haute-Normandie	9 484	0.72	12.52	8.20
	FR24	Centre	9 304	0.52	9.65	8.18
	FR25	Basse-Normandie	7 148	0.70	10.40	
	FR26	Bourgogne	9 048	0.78	11.08	8.44
	FR41	Lorraine	9 160	0.55	10.64	
	FR42	Alsace	7 548	0.55	8.60	11.08
	FR43	Franche-Comté	7 232	0.90	9.89	8.83
	FR51	Pays de la Loire	13 788	0.57	14.13	
	FR52	Bretagne	9 368	0.43	11.23	
	FR53	Poitou-Charentes	8 284	0.66	12.26	8.15
	FR61	Aquitaine	10 624	0.47	11.48	
	FR62	Midi-Pyrénées	9 028	0.45	12.92	8.57
	FR63	Limousin	6 604	1.29	8.69	12.36
	FR72	Auvergne	6 276	0.66	11.22	8.55
	FR81	Languedoc-Roussillon	10 376	0.57	11.50	
	FR82	Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur	18 628	0.53	8.84	
Poland	PL33	Swietokrzyskie	8 776	0.81	9.13	8.22
	PL34	Podlaskie	6 964	0.83	8.98	9.25
	PL42	Zachodniopomorskie	7 580	0.66	8.43	8.86
	PL43	Lubuskie	7 460	0.88		8.10
	PL52	Opolskie	6 576	0.90	10.22	9.16
	PL62	Warminsko-Mazurskie	8 092	0.74	10.17	8.14
	PL63	Pomorskie	8 676	0.58	8.71	
Portugal	PT15	Algarve	13 064	4.06	9.82	9.38
	PT18	Alentejo	15 440	2.67	8.21	8.56
Romania	RO11	Nord-Vest	25 500	1.19	11.76	
	RO12	Centru	25 144	1.26	9.75	
	RO21	Nord-Est	31 296	1.10	12.34	

Table 6. Regions with 300 000 inhabitants or more, where the relative standard error (RSE) for the estimate of annual average unemployment (5%) exceeded 8% in 2006-2007

Country	Region (NUTS II)		2007 yearly sample size (15-74 years)	2007 yearly sampling rate (%) (15-74 years)	RSE 2006	RSE 2007
United Kingdom	RO22	Sud-Est	25 944	1.15	8.60	8.38
	RO32	Bucuresti — Ilfov	18 656	1.03	11.00	
	RO41	Sud-Vest — Oltenia	21 792	1.21	11.55	8.10
	RO42	Vest	18 076	1.18	10.54	8.64
	UKD1	Cumbria	3 152	0.84	11.55	11.32
	UKD2	Cheshire	5 756	0.79	8.84	8.55
	UKE1	East Riding and North Lincolnshire	5 536	0.83	8.72	9.46
	UKE2	North Yorkshire	4 560	0.77	10.19	8.94
	UKF3	Lincolnshire	4 292	0.83	10.34	10.46
	UKK3	Cornwall and Isles of Scilly	3 060	0.80	12.20	12.27
	UKK4	Devon	6 444	0.78	8.38	
	UKM5	North Eastern Scotland	2 876	0.84	11.52	11.92
	UKM6	Highlands and Islands	3 520	0.80	11.07	10.38

Note: Empty cells indicate that the RSE was under the threshold.

(*) 2007 CVs used as proxy of 2006 CVs for the calculation of the design effect (see Annex II)

3.2 In the case of a continuous survey, for sub-populations which constitute 5% of the working age population the relative standard error at national level for the estimate of changes between two successive quarters, shall not exceed 2% of the sub-population in question.

For Member States with a population of between one million and twenty million inhabitants, this requirement is relaxed so that the relative standard error for the estimate of quarterly changes shall not exceed 3% of the sub-population in question.

Member States whose population is below one million inhabitants are exempt from these precision requirements concerning changes.

The total population is taken into account when determining which precision requirement in Article 3(2) is relevant for which country. According to this criterion, Cyprus, Luxembourg, Malta and Iceland were exempt from these requirements as they had less than one million inhabitants. Croatia (in 2006 only), Turkey¹⁰ and Switzerland are not concerned since they do not conduct a continuous survey.

Although Article 3(2) does not refer to any specific characteristic, the assessment is made for unemployment. As for Article 3(1), the age group used as benchmark for the sample size and the sampling fraction is 15-74.

Also for Article 3(2) the assessment is based on ad hoc assumptions about theoretical design effects (see Annex II). Therefore the same remarks on the interpretation of the results apply as for Article 3(1).

¹⁰ Although only covering all the weeks of the year but only the first week of each month, the Turkish LFS produces quarterly results. By applying the hypothesis outlined below, Turkey meets the requirements stated in article 3.2.

Germany, Poland and Romania exceeded the benchmark of 2 % for countries with more than 20 million inhabitants, whereas Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovenia, Croatia and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia exceeded the benchmark of 3 % for countries with a population between 1 million and 20 million inhabitants. The 2006 and 2007 relative standard errors for the estimate of quarterly change in unemployment corresponding to 5 % of the working age population for these countries are shown in table 7.

Table 7. Countries with a continuous survey and 1 million population or more, where the relative standard error for the estimate of quarterly change in unemployment (5 %) exceeded 2 % or 3 % in 2006-2007

Population	Country	RSE	RSE
		2006	2007
20 million +	Germany	2.10	2.19
	Poland	3.11	3.10
	Romania	4.28	4.83
1-20 million	Belgium	5.65	5.60
	Bulgaria	4.64	4.80
	Denmark	5.52	3.57
	Estonia	9.60	9.01
	Latvia	13.33	7.68
	Lithuania	6.63	5.71
	Slovenia	4.99	5.01
	Croatia	-	6.99
	Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	9.76	9.48

3.3 Where the survey is carried out only in the spring, at least a quarter of the survey units are taken from the preceding survey and at least a quarter form part of the following survey.

These two groups shall be identified by a code.

Article 3(3) is only relevant for Croatia for 2006 and Switzerland. In 2006, Croatia had no overlap between successive years, and thus did not comply with Article 3(3). This changed in 2007 with the implementation of the continuous quarterly survey adopting a sample design with a quarterly and yearly rotation scheme. The Swiss sample design provides for a yearly rotation pattern, complying with Article 3(3).

3.4 Where non-response to certain questions results in missing data, a method of statistical imputation shall be applied where appropriate.

Only eleven out of 32 participating countries applied statistical imputation (Table 8). Five countries — Italy, Austria, Spain, Romania and Slovenia — imputed for all or most of the variables. The remaining countries mostly imputed when missing data pertained to hours worked or wages. Three main methods were used: hot-deck, regression and means with classes.

Table 8. Imputation of variables (2007)

	Country	Variable	Method
Imputation	Germany	Usual hours and actual hours worked and economic activity	Hot-deck
	Spain	All variables	Manual imputation (for household variables)

Table 8. Imputation of variables (2007)

Country	Variable	Method
<i>France</i>	Wages	and Fellegi-Holt, donor technique
<i>Italy</i>	All variables	Regression
<i>Malta</i>	Wages	Fellegi-Holt, donor technique
<i>Austria</i>	All variables	Means with classes
<i>Slovenia</i>	All variables except for Col. 3, Col. 10, Col. 4/5, Col. 6/7, Col. 8/9, Col. 23, Col. 24, Col. 26, Col. 27/29, Col. 30/33, Col. 60, Col. 62/63, Col. 66, Col. 74, Col. 75/76, Col. 77/79, Col. 80/81, Col. 98, Col. 101, Col. 118/119 and Col. 312/315	Hot-deck
<i>Finland</i>	Actual hours worked	Hot-deck
<i>Iceland</i>	Usual and actual hours of work	Mean imputation with classes (professional status and economic activity)
<i>Norway</i>	Underemployment, desired working hours, actual hours worked	Regression
No imputation	<i>Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Greece, Ireland, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Hungary, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Sweden, United Kingdom, Bulgaria, Croatia, Romania, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Switzerland</i>	Hot-deck

Source: Quality Reports.

3.5. The weighting factors are calculated taking into account in particular the probability of selection and external data relating to the distribution of the population being surveyed, by sex, age (five-year age groups) and region (NUTS II level), where such external data are held to be sufficiently reliable by the Member States concerned.

All the participating countries took into account the probability of selection. All except Croatia used sex and age in the weighting process. Bulgaria, Germany, Greece, Luxembourg, Hungary, Malta and Slovenia used broader age groups than five-year groups. All of the countries with more than one NUTS II region used at least NUTS II regions for calculating the weighting factors¹¹, except France up to 2006 and Denmark in 2007.

3.6. Member States shall provide the Commission (Eurostat) with whatever information is required concerning the organisation and methodology of the survey, and in particular, they shall indicate the criteria adopted for the design and size of the sample.

Information for methodological information on the LFS is requested by Eurostat in a standardised form by means of annual quality reports, organised according to a standard definition of quality components. In 2006 and 2007 all participating countries provided Eurostat with these reports (for 2007 Iceland only provided partial information), the only exception being the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia for 2007. The participating countries also provide the Commission (Eurostat) with quarterly information relating to the precision of selected characteristics, non-response, publication thresholds and recent and anticipated changes in the survey design.

¹¹ The whole country constitutes a NUTS II region in Denmark until 2006, Estonia, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Slovenia and Iceland.

4. ARTICLE 4 — SURVEY CHARACTERISTICS

The characteristics to be surveyed in the period 2006-2007 are defined by Council Regulation (EC) 577/98¹², as amended by Commission Regulation (EC) 2104/2002¹³ and by EP and Council Regulation (EC) 2257/2003¹⁴. The latter introduced into the list of mandatory variables, from 2006 onwards, six new variables: continuing receipt of wages and salary; supervisory responsibility; involvement of public employment service in finding the current job; contract with a temporary work agency; number of hours of overtime in the reference week; lack of care facility. It also introduced module ‘n’ on atypical working times, hitherto surveyed on the basis of a gentlemen’s agreement. The codification to be used for transmission of data to Eurostat, against which the assessment in this section is performed, is defined by Commission Regulation (EC) No 430/2005¹⁵, which also covers the abovementioned innovations.

Variables not provided in 2006 and 2007 are listed in the tables from 9(a) to 9(n). Whenever a country is mentioned in connection with a quarterly variable, this means that – unless otherwise specified – it did not provide that variable for all the four quarters of the corresponding year. The cases in which variables were provided, but where the same code was used for all applicable cases, are also mentioned.

4.1 Data shall be provided on:

(a) demographic background:

- *sequence number in the household,*
- *sex,*
- *year of birth,*
- *date of birth in relation to the end of the reference period,*
- *marital status,*
- *relationship to reference person,*
- *sequence number of spouse,*
- *sequence number of father,*
- *sequence number of mother,*
- *nationality,*
- *number of years of residence in the Member State,*
- *country of birth (optional),*
- *nature of participation in the survey (direct participation or proxy through another member of the household);*

Table 9(a). Non-optional variables in module a, not provided in 2006-2007

Periodicity	Characteristic	2006	2007	Comments
Yearly	Relationship to reference person in the household	IE	IE	2006: not provided. 2007: provided with errors, which prevents its use SE, NO, IS and CH: sample of individuals and no household sub-sample
		SE	SE	
		NO	NO	
		IS	IS	
		CH	CH	
Yearly	Sequence number of spouse or cohabiting partner	SE	SE	SE, NO, IS and CH: sample of

¹² OJ L 77, 14.3.1998, p. 3.

¹³ OJ L 324, 29.11.2002, p.14.

¹⁴ OJ L 336, 23.12.2003, p. 6.

¹⁵ OJ L 71, 17.3.2005, p. 36.

Table 9(a). Non-optional variables in module a, not provided in 2006-2007

Periodicity	Characteristic	2006	2007	Comments
		NO	NO	individuals and no household sub-sample
		IS	IS	
		CH	CH	
		IE	IE	
Yearly	Sequence number of father	SE	SE	SE, NO, IS and CH: sample of individuals and no household sub-sample
		NO	NO	
		IS	IS	
		CH	CH	
		IE	IE	Variable provided with errors, which prevents its use
Yearly	Sequence number of mother	SE	SE	SE, NO, IS and CH: sample of individuals and no household sub-sample
		NO	NO	
		IS	IS	
		CH	CH	
		IE	IE	Variable provided with errors, which prevents its use
Quarterly	Date of birth in relation to the end of reference period	IE		Variable provided, but with constant values for Q3 and Q4
Quarterly	Nationality	TR	TR	Variable provided with old classification, which prevents its use
		IE	IE	
Yearly	Years of residence in this country	MK	MK	
		IS		

Source: EU-LFS

(b) labour status:

- *labour status during the reference week,*
- *continuing receipt of wages and salary,*
- *reason for not having worked though having a job,*
- *search for employment for person without employment,*
- *type of employment sought (self-employed or employee),*
- *methods used to find a job,*
- *availability to start work;*

Table 9(b). Non-optional variables in module b, not provided in 2006-2007

Periodicity	Characteristic	2006	2007	Comments
Quarterly	Continuing receipt of the wage or salary	EE	EE	Variable provided with constant values, except for Q1 and Q2 2007, when it was correctly provided Implemented from 2008 onwards
		FI	FI	
		IE		
		FR	FR	
Quarterly	Type of employment sought (non-employed)	UK	UK	Variable provided only for Q2. Quarterly from 2008
			HR	
Quarterly	Studied advertisements in newspapers or journals (employed)	MK		Variable provided from Q2 2007
Quarterly	Took a test, interview or examination (non-employed)	IS	IS	Variable provided from Q2 2007
		UK	UK	
Quarterly	Looked for land, premises or equipment (non-employed)	IE		
			MK	
Quarterly	Looked for permits, licences, financial resources (non-employed)	IE		
Quarterly	Awaiting the results of an application for a job (non-employed)	FR	FR	
		MT	MT	

Table 9(b). Non-optional variables in module b, not provided in 2006-2007

Periodicity	Characteristic	2006	2007	Comments
		NL	NL	
		PT	PT	
		MK		
Quarterly	Waiting for a call from a public employment office (non-employed)	CH		
		FR	FR	
		IS	IS	Variable provided from Q2 2007
		MT	MT	
		PT	PT	
		UK	UK	
		MK		
Quarterly	Awaiting the results of a competition for recruitment to the public sector (non-employed)	CH		
		FI	FI	Not applicable in Finland
		FR	FR	
		IS	IS	Variable provided from Q2 2007
		MT	MT	
		NL	NL	
		NO	NO	
		PT	PT	
		SI	SI	Not applicable in Slovenia
		UK	UK	
		MK	MK	
Quarterly	Other method used (non-employed)	BG	BG	
		EE	EE	
		IE		
		PT	PT	
		MK		Variable provided, but with constant values for Q3
Quarterly	Availability to start working within two weeks (non-employed)	CY		Variable provided, but with constant values for Q3
		EE		Variable provided, but with constant values for Q4

Source: EU-LFS

(c) employment characteristics of the main job:

- *professional status,*
- *economic activity of local unit,*
- *occupation,*
- *supervisory responsibilities,*
- *number of persons working at the local unit,*
- *country of place of work,*
- *region of place of work,*
- *year and month when the person started working in current employment,*
- *involvement of public employment service in finding the current job,*
- *permanency of the job (and reasons),*
- *duration of temporary job or work contract of limited duration,*
- *full-time/part-time distinction (and reasons),*
- *contract with a temporary work agency,*
- *working at home;*

Table 9(c). Non-optional variables in module c, not provided in 2006-2007

Periodicity	Characteristic	2006	2007	Comments
Yearly	Supervisory responsibilities	FI	FI	Implemented from 2008 onwards
		IE		

Table 9(c). Non-optional variables in module c, not provided in 2006-2007

Periodicity	Characteristic	2006	2007	Comments
		MK		
		NO	NO	Implemented from 2008 onwards
Quarterly	Country of place of work	CY	CY	Variable provided, but with constant values (always Cyprus)
		EL	EL	Variable provided, but with constant values (always Greece)
		IS	IS	Variable provided from Q2 2007
		NO	NO	
		TR	TR	
Quarterly	Region of place of work	CY	CY	Variable provided, but with constant values (always Cyprus, which is one NUTS2 region)
		HR		
		IS	IS	Variable provided from Q2 2007
		LT	LT	Variable provided, but with constant values (always Lithuania, which is one NUTS2 region)
		LV	LV	Variable provided, but with constant values (always Latvia, which is one NUTS2 region)
		SI	SI	Implemented from 2008 onwards
		MK	MK	
Yearly	Involvement of the public employment office at any moment in finding the present job	CH	CH	Implemented from 2010 onwards
		FI	FI	Implemented from 2008 onwards
		IE		
		MK		
Quarterly	Full-time/part-time distinction	IE		
Quarterly	Total duration of temporary job or work contract of limited duration	IE		Variable not provided for Q3 and Q4
		UK	UK	Variable provided only for Q2. Quarterly from 2008
		MK		
Yearly	Contract with a temporary employment agency	CY	CY	Variable provided, but with constant values
		FI	FI	Implemented from 2008 onwards
		IE	IE	
		IS		
		PT		Variable collected and sent to Eurostat, but at INE's request not disseminated for quality reasons
		MK		
		TR	TR	Variable not provided because no temporary agencies in Turkey

Source: EU-LFS

(d) hours worked:

- number of hours per week usually worked,
- number of hours actually worked,
- number of hours of overtime in the reference week,
- main reason for hours actually worked being different from usual hours;

Table 9(d). Non-optional variables in module d, not provided in 2006-2007

Periodicity	Characteristic	2006	2007	Comments
Quarterly	Paid overtime in the reference week in the main job	IE		
		HR		
			MK	
		IS	IS	Variable provided from Q2 2007
		CH	CH	Implemented from 2010 onwards
Quarterly	Unpaid overtime in the reference week in the main job	IE		

Table 9(d). Non-optional variables in module d, not provided in 2006-2007

Periodicity	Characteristic	2006	2007	Comments
			FI	
			MK	
		TR	TR	
		IS	IS	Variable provided from Q2 2007
		CH	CH	Implemented from 2010 onwards

Source: EU-LFS

(e) *second job:*

- *existence of more than one job,*
- *professional status,*
- *economic activity of the local unit,*
- *number of hours actually worked;*

All the participating countries provided data relating to all of the characteristics of module e.

(f) *visible underemployment:*

- *wish to work usually more than the current number of hours (optional in the case of an annual survey),*
- *looking for another job and reasons for doing so,*
- *type of employment sought (as employee or otherwise),*
- *methods used to find another job,*
- *reasons why the person is not seeking another job (optional in the case of an annual survey),*
- *availability to start work,*
- *number of hours of work wished for (optional in the case of an annual survey);*

Table 9(f). Non-optional variables in module f, not provided in 2006-2007

Periodicity	Characteristic	2006	2007	Comments
Quarterly	Looking for another job	MK		
Quarterly	Type of employment sought (or found) (employed)	CH	CH	.
		UK	UK	Variable provided only for Q2. Quarterly from 2008
			MK	
			HR	Variable provided only for Q4
Quarterly	Contacted public employment office to find work (employed)	IE		
		IS		Variable provided, but with constant values for Q1, Q3 and Q4
Quarterly	Contacted private employment agency to find work (employed)	CY	CY	Variable provided but with constant values for all 2006 quarters and Q1 2007
		IE		
		TR	TR	
Quarterly	Applied to employers directly (employed)	IE		
Quarterly	Asked friends, relatives, trade unions, etc. (employed)	IE		
Quarterly	Inserted or answered advertisements in newspapers or journals (employed)	IE		
Quarterly	Studied advertisements in newspapers or journals (employed)	IE		
		TR	TR	

Table 9(f). Non-optional variables in module f, not provided in 2006-2007

Periodicity	Characteristic	2006	2007	Comments
Quarterly	Took a test, interview or examination (employed)	IE		Variable provided, but with constant values for Q1, Q3 and Q4
		IS		
		UK	UK	
Quarterly	Looked for land, premises or equipment (employed)	IE		Variable provided, but with constant values for Q1 and Q4 2006 and Q1, Q3 and Q4 2007
Quarterly	Looked for permits, licences, financial resources (employed)	CY	CY	
		IE		
		TR	MK TR	
Quarterly	Awaiting the results of an application for a job (employed)	FI	FI	Variable provided, but with constant values for Q2 and Q3 2006 and Q1, Q3 and Q4 2007
		FR	FR	
		IE		
		MT	MT	Variable provided with constant values, except for Q2 2006 when it was correctly provided
		NL	NL	
Quarterly	Waiting for a call from a public employment office (employed)	CH	CH	Implemented from 2010 onwards
		FI	FI	Variable provided, but with constant values for Q1, Q2 and Q3 2006 and Q3 and Q4 2007
		FR	FR	
		IE		Variable provided, but with constant values for Q1, Q3 and Q4
		IS		
		MT	MT	
		TR	TR	
		UK	UK	
Quarterly	Awaiting the results of a competition for recruitment to the public sector (employed)	CH	CH	Not applicable in Finland
		FI	FI	
		FR	FR	
		IE		Variable provided, but with constant values for Q1, Q3 and Q4
		IS		
		MT	MT	Variable provided, but with constant values for Q1, Q3 and Q4 2006 and Q1, Q3 and Q4 2007
		NL	NL	
		SI	SI	
		NO	NO	Not applicable in Slovenia
		UK	UK	
		TR	MK TR	
Quarterly	Other method used (employed)	BG	BG	
		ES	ES	
		IE		
Quarterly	Availability to start working within two weeks (employed)	IE		Variable provided, but with constant values
		MT		

Source: EU-LFS

(g) *search for employment:*

- *type of employment sought,*
- *duration of search for employment,*
- *situation of person immediately before starting to seek employment,*
- *registration at public employment office and whether receiving benefits,*
- *for person not seeking employment, willingness to work,*
- *reasons why person has not sought work,*
- *lack of care facilities;*

Table 9(g). Non-optional variables in module g, not provided in 2006-2007

Periodicity	Characteristic	2006	2007	Comments
Yearly	Reasons for not seeking employment	UK	UK	
Quarterly	Duration of search for employment (non employed)	SE		Variable not provided for Q1
Quarterly	Duration of search for employment (employed)	CH IE SE	CH MK	Variable not provided for Q1
Yearly	Situation immediately before person started to seek employment (or was waiting for new job to start)	FR IE MK	FR IE MK	
Yearly	Need for care facilities	FI UK MK	FI UK MK	Implemented from 2008 onwards
Yearly	Registration at a public employment office	IE NO TR	IE NO	

Source: EU-LFS

(h) *education and training*

- *participation in formal education or training during previous four weeks*
 - *level*
 - *field;*
- *participation in courses and other taught learning activities during previous four weeks*
 - *total length,*
 - *purpose of the most recent course or other taught activity,*
 - *field of the most recent taught activity,*
 - *participated in most recent taught activity during working hours;*
- *educational attainment*
 - *highest successfully completed level of education or training,*
 - *field of this highest level of education and training,*
 - *year when this highest level was successfully completed;*

Table 9(h). Non-optional variables in module h, not provided in 2006-2007

Periodicity	Characteristic	2006	2007	Comments
Quarterly	Level of this education or training	IS NO	IS	
Quarterly	Number of hours spent on all taught learning	CH	CH	From 2010

Table 9(h). Non-optional variables in module h, not provided in 2006-2007

Periodicity	Characteristic	2006	2007	Comments
	activities within the last four weeks			
Quarterly	Highest level of education or training successfully completed	IS		Variable not provided in Q4
Yearly	Field of highest level of education or training successfully completed	IE	IE	
Yearly	Year when highest level of education or training was successfully completed	NO	NO	

Source: EU-LFS

(i) *previous work experience of person not in employment:*

- *existence of previous employment experience,*
- *year and month in which the person last worked,*
- *main reason for leaving last job or business,*
- *professional status in last job,*
- *economic activity of local unit in which person last worked,*
- *occupation of last job;*

Table 9(i). Non-optional variables in module i, not provided in 2006-2007

Periodicity	Characteristic	2006	2007	Comments
Quarterly	Month in which person last worked	HR		
Quarterly	Professional status in last job	IE		
Quarterly	Economic activity of the local unit in which person last worked		LU	
Quarterly	Occupation of last job	FR NL	FR	

Source: EU-LFS

(j) *situation one year before the survey (optional for quarters 1, 3, 4)*

- *main labour status,*
- *professional status,*
- *economic activity of local unit in which person was working,*
- *country of residence,*
- *region of residence;*

Table 9(j). Non-optional variables in module j, not provided in 2006-2007

Periodicity	Characteristic	2006	2007	Comments
Yearly	Situation with regard to activity one year before survey	BG	BG	
		CH	CH	Implemented from 2010 onwards
		IE	IE	
		SE		
Yearly	Economic activity of local unit in which person was working one year before survey		LU	
Yearly	Country of residence one year before survey	CH	CH	Implemented from 2010 onwards
		IS		
		NO	NO	
		SI	SI	Implemented from 2008 onwards
		TR	TR	
Yearly	Region of residence one year before survey	CH	CH	Implemented from 2010 onwards Variable provided, but with constant values (always Cyprus, which is one NUTS2 region)
		CY		

Table 9(j). Non-optional variables in module j, not provided in 2006-2007

Periodicity	Characteristic	2006	2007	Comments
		IS		
		LT	LT	Variable provided, but with constant values (always Lithuania, which is one NUTS2 region)
		NO	NO	
		SI	SI	Implemented from 2008 onwards

Source: EU-LFS

(k) main labour status (optional);

Although module k is optional, only seven countries (Bulgaria, Germany, the United Kingdom, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Norway and Switzerland) did not provide data on the variable main status in 2006 and 2007.

(l) income (optional);

In 2006 and 2007, sixteen countries did not provide any data for the optional variable income: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Germany, Ireland, Spain, Cyprus, the Netherlands, Austria, Romania, Slovenia, Slovakia, Finland, Sweden, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland and Norway.

(m) technical items relating to the interview

- *year of survey,*
- *reference week,*
- *interview week,*
- *Member State,*
- *region of household,*
- *degree of urbanisation,*
- *serial number of household,*
- *type of household,*
- *type of institution,*
- *weighting factor,*
- *sub-sample in relation to the preceding survey (annual survey),*
- *sub-sample in relation to the following survey (annual survey),*
- *sequence number of the survey wave.*

Table 9(m). Non-optional variables in module m, not provided in 2006-2007

Periodicity	Characteristic	2006	2007	Comments
Quarterly	Region of household	HR		
		MK	MK	
Quarterly	Degree of urbanisation	BG		Variable provided from Q2
		CH	CH	
		IS	IS	
		NO	NO	Variable provided from Q3 2008
		RO	RO	
		SK		
		MK	MK	
Quarterly	Sequence number of the survey wave	TR	TR	
			HR	

Table 9(m). Non-optional variables in module m, not provided in 2006-2007

Periodicity	Characteristic	2006	2007	Comments
		MK	MK	

Source: EU-LFS

(n) atypical working times:

- shift work,
- evening work,
- night work,
- Saturday work,
- Sunday work.

Table 9(n). Non-optional variables in module n, not provided in 2006-2007

Periodicity	Characteristic	2006	2007	Comments
Yearly	Evening work	PT	PT	Not included, as evening work was believed to be very limited and would be confused with night work

Source: EU-LFS

4.2. A further set of variables, hereinafter referred to as an ‘ad hoc module’, may be added to supplement the information described above in paragraph 1. A programme of ad hoc modules covering several years shall be drawn up each year.

A programme of ad hoc modules covering several years shall be drawn up each year according to the procedure laid down in Article 8:

- this programme shall specify for each ad hoc module, the subject, the reference period, the sample size (equal to or less than the sample size determined according to Article 3) and the deadline for the transmission of the results (which may be different from the deadline according to Article 6),
- the Member States and regions covered and the detailed list of information to be collected in an ad hoc module shall be drawn up at least twelve months before the beginning of the reference period for that module,
- the volume of an ad hoc module shall be limited to 11 variables.

An ad hoc module on transition from work into retirement and one on accidents at work and work-related health problems were carried out in 2006 and 2007 respectively. The topics, reference periods, geographical coverage and deadlines for data transmission for the two ad hoc modules were laid down in Commission Regulations (EC) No 246/2003¹⁶ and No 384/2005¹⁷ respectively. The specifications of the 2006 ad hoc module, including the list of variables and their codification, were adopted through Commission Regulation (EC) No 388/2005¹⁸; those of the 2007 ad hoc module were adopted through Commission Regulation (EC) No 341/2006¹⁹.

¹⁶ OJ L 34, 11.2.2003, p. 3.

¹⁷ OJ L 61, 8.3.2005, p. 23.

¹⁸ OJ L 62, 9.3.2005, p. 7.

¹⁹ OJ L 55, 25.2.2006, p. 9.

As part of the implementation of ad hoc modules, each module is evaluated afterwards. The evaluation report for the 2006 ad hoc module on transition from work into retirement is available²⁰, while the evaluation of the 2007 ad hoc module on accidents at work and work-related health problems is due for the end of 2009. The following headings highlight the main findings regarding implementation of the legislation concerning the 2006 and 2007 ad hoc modules.

Geographical coverage: All the participating countries implemented both ad hoc modules, except for Croatia and Iceland in 2006 and, in both years, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Switzerland.

Reference period: The reference period in the ad hoc modules 2006 and 2007 was specified as either the second quarter in the respective year or the whole year. In general, participating countries complied with this requirement. Exceptions for the 2007 ad hoc module were the Netherlands, Austria and the United Kingdom. The Netherlands used quarters 2 to 4 as reference period²¹, Austria only surveyed it for quarters 1 to 3, while the United Kingdom used quarter 1 as the reference period. Of the complying countries, the Czech Republic, Germany, Estonia, Spain, France, Luxembourg, Finland, Sweden, Norway and, for the 2006 module, the Netherlands, Austria and the United Kingdom opted to spread the data collection over the whole year. All other countries used the second quarter as the reference period.

Data collected: All countries which carried out the two ad hoc modules covered all variables, except for Bulgaria in 2006, which did not provide information for the variable '*Person reduced his/her working hours in a move to full retirement*', and Iceland in 2007, which did not cover the five variables in the section on *work-related health problems suffered during the last 12 months (apart from accidental injuries)*:

- '*Illness(es), disability(ies) or other physical or psychic health problem(s), apart from accidental injuries, suffered by the person during the past 12 months (from the date of the interview) and that was (were), caused or made worse by work*',
- '*Type of the most serious complaint caused or made worse by work*',
- '*Whether the most serious complaint caused or made worse by work limits the ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities either at work or outside work*',
- '*Number of days off work during the last 12 months due to the most serious complaint caused or made worse by work*' and
- '*Job that caused or made worse the most serious complaint*'.

Deadline for data transmission: for both ad hoc modules, the deadline for sending Eurostat the microdata was 31 March of the year following the reference year. In the case of the 2006 module, 27 of the 28 participating countries delivered a dataset on time, while Ireland transmitted the first data 32 weeks later. Twelve countries — Germany, Greece, Spain,

²⁰ Eurostat: *Final report of the task force for evaluating the 2006 LFS ad hoc module on 'transition from work into retirement'*, is available on request.

²¹ This was due to adjustments in the questionnaire from the second quarter onwards which did not allow to use data collected for the first quarter.

Finland, France, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Norway, Poland and Slovenia — sent revisions after the deadline. As for the 2007 ad hoc module, all of the 30 participating countries delivered a dataset by the deadline, except Denmark (3 weeks late), France (1 week), Iceland (34 weeks) and Norway (3 weeks). Nine countries (Austria, Germany, Denmark, Spain, France, Malta, Norway and Slovenia) sent revisions after the deadline.

4.3. The definitions, the edits to be used, the codification of the variables, the adjustment of the list of survey variables made necessary by the evolution of techniques and concepts, and a list of principles for the formulation of the questions concerning the labour status, are drawn up according to the procedure laid down in Article 8.

The Commission has adopted two Regulations: first, Regulation (EC) No 973/2007²² implementing the statistical classification of economic activities NACE Revision 2 in some statistical domains among which the Labour Force Survey; second, Regulation (EC) No 377/2008²³ concerning the codification to be used for data transmission from 2009 onwards, the use of a sub-sample for the collection of data on structural variables and the definition of the reference quarters. These regulations are being implemented from 2008 and 2009 respectively.

Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000²⁴ sets out the operational definition of unemployment and the principles for the formulation of the questions on labour status.

The definition of unemployment

By the end of 2007, a majority of participating countries were still not fully complying with the definition of unemployment. Spain, the United Kingdom and Iceland referred unemployment to the 16-74 age group. Eighteen countries still used two weeks after the interview as a reference period for the availability of a person to take up a new job, rather than two weeks after the reference week (see table 10)²⁵. Estonia, Ireland and Slovenia still did not check whether a job which was due to start later would start within three months, whereas the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, although it asked the question, considered as unemployed those who would start a job after three months but were currently available to start working. Estonia and Ireland still did not ask about availability to start work within two weeks in the case of people who had already found a job which would start later. Ten countries did not check the conditions under which lay-offs could be classified as unemployed, i.e. (a) receiving a significant wage or salary during the absence and (b) seeking employment and being currently available to start working. Germany did not ask about the former condition, while Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, the Netherlands, Slovakia, Sweden, the United Kingdom, Croatia and Iceland did not verify the latter. Luxembourg and Portugal did not check either of the two requirements for lay-offs.

²² OJ L 216, 21.8.2007, p. 10.

²³ OJ L 114, 26.4.2008, p. 57.

²⁴ OJ L 228, 8.9.2000, p. 18.

²⁵ The discrepancies can be partly attributed to the fact that the Explanatory Notes for the EU-LFS continued to use the interview week as the starting point for the availability period, despite this having been changed by Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000. Explanatory notes on this point have been changed for 2008 data collection onwards.

Table 10. Participating countries not fully complying with the definition of unemployment by the end of 2007

Divergence from the definition	Countries
Age group not defined as 15-74	Spain, United Kingdom, Iceland
The reference period for the availability of a person to take up a new job ends 2 weeks after the end of the interview week but not after the end of the reference week.	Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Greece, Ireland, Cyprus, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Hungary, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Slovenia, Finland, Croatia, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Iceland
Job found, which starts later, but not checked whether it starts within 3 months	Estonia, Ireland, Slovenia, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
If job is found, which starts later, no check is made on the availability to start work	Estonia, Ireland
Lay-offs not asked if they receive any significant wage or if they are seeking work and are currently available	Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Germany, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Slovakia, Sweden, United Kingdom, Croatia, Iceland

Sources: Quality Reports, National Questionnaires.

The twelve principles for formulating the questionnaire

Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000 lays down twelve principles for formulating the questionnaire. In 2007, only principles 8 and 11 were fully observed by all thirty-two countries. Most of the divergences relate to principles 2, 3, 6 and 10. Table 11 summarises the situation with regard to each of the principles. A detailed analysis can be found in Annex I to this document.

Table 11. Countries not observing or only partly observing the principles for formulating the questions on labour status by the end of 2007

Principle	Status	Countries
Principle 1	Not observed	Ireland, Malta, Croatia
	Partly observed	Slovenia, United Kingdom, Netherlands ²⁶
Principle 2	Partly observed	Germany, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal
Principle 3	Not observed	United Kingdom, Croatia
	Partly observed	Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Germany, Estonia, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Slovakia, Finland, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Iceland, Switzerland
Principle 4	Not observed	Hungary, Malta
Principle 5	Not observed	Denmark
Principle 6	Not observed	Czech Republic, Greece, Cyprus, Luxembourg, Hungary, Malta, Netherlands, Slovenia, Croatia, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland
	Partly observed	Belgium, Bulgaria, Germany, Estonia, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Finland, Turkey, Switzerland
Principle 7	Not observed	Netherlands
Principle 9	Not observed	France, Malta, Portugal
Principle 10	Not observed	Turkey
	Partly observed	Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Slovakia, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland, Norway, Switzerland
Principle 12	Not observed	Estonia, Ireland, Slovenia

Source: Annex I.

Principle 1 was not observed by Ireland, Malta and Croatia. In these countries, the questions on labour status were not the first ones on the individual questionnaire, did not immediately follow the questions on the demographic characteristics of the household members, and were preceded by questions on the main status.

Malta also preceded the question on labour status with a question on registration at a public employment office. Slovenia and the United Kingdom partly deviated from this principle by not having the questions on employment status among the first questions in the questionnaire²⁶.

Principle 2 was only partially observed by five countries. Germany, Luxembourg and Portugal did not check the conditions for identifying people on lay-off²⁷. In Lithuania, the question about actually working was put in the reference week, after a question on having a job. The Netherlands deviated from this principle as regards both the formulation of the question on currently being at work and the sequence of questions on employment.

Principle 3 was not observed by the United Kingdom and Croatia, as their questions on employment did not contain any cue for the identification of persons with a minor job. In addition, questions on job search in their questionnaire did not specify that jobs lasting only a few hours, or even one hour, still have to be considered. Twenty-two countries only partly respected principle 3 in that they did not fulfil the latter condition.

Principle 4 was not observed by Hungary and Malta, which did not probe for unpaid family workers.

Principle 5 was not observed by Denmark, whose questionnaire referred only to ‘work’, but did not clearly indicate that only work for pay or profit is considered as an economic activity.

Principle 6 was not observed by eleven countries, which did not fully align to any of the prescriptions concerning the reference period for employment, job search, job search methods and availability to start working. The principle was only partially observed by eleven countries, which respected at least one but not all of those requirements. In particular, fifteen countries mentioned the reference week for employment but did not give the exact dates, whereas one country — the Netherlands — surveyed labour status with reference to the current situation at the time of the interview. Nineteen countries mentioned the past four weeks as the reference period for job search and seventeen did so for job search methods, but did not refer to the reference week. Two countries did not follow either of the two prescriptions for job search and four deviated from both requirements for job search methods. Finally, for eighteen countries the reference period for job availability did not start from the reference week (see also Table 10 and footnote 27).

Principle 7 was not observed by the Netherlands, which did not apply the question on job search to all non-employed, but filtered out those who answered in the negative to a question on whether they wanted to work.

²⁶ In the Netherlands, the effects of this deviation on labour status were found negligible after ad hoc tests, so that the principle can be considered as respected.

²⁷ Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000 offers two types of test for measuring the job attachment of persons on lay-off. In both cases, for a person to be considered employed, the period of absence cannot exceed three months. In addition, the first type of test refers to whether or not significant salary is received; the other checks whether there is an assurance to return to work at the end of the period of absence. Principle 2 favours the second approach, while the definition of unemployment and the Explanatory Notes of the European Union Labour Force Survey favour the first approach. In assessing adherence to principle 2 both approaches have been considered in line with this principle.

Principle 9 was not observed by France, Malta and Portugal²⁸, which did not ask for passive search methods in addition to active ones.

Principle 10 was not observed by Turkey, which deviated from two prescriptions: that contact with the public employment office in order to find work should be included as the first question on job search methods, and that this contact should be distinct from the renewal of a registration to claim unemployment benefits and from any assistance provided by the employment office to improve the employability of the registered unemployed person.

Nine countries only partially observed principle 10, as they did not specify in their questionnaires that the contact with the public employment agency must be *in order to find work* as distinct from maintaining or renewing the person's status as registered unemployed.

Principle 12 was not observed by Estonia, Ireland and Slovenia, which did not check whether or not a job which had been found would start within three months (see above Table 10).

4.4. On a proposal from the Commission, a list of variables, hereinafter referred to as 'structural variables', may be identified from among the survey characteristics specified in paragraph 1 which need to be surveyed only as annual averages with reference to 52 weeks rather than as quarterly averages. This list of structural variables, the minimum sample size and the survey frequency will be drawn up in accordance with the procedure laid down in Article 8. Spain, Finland and the United Kingdom may survey the structural variables with reference to a single quarter during a transition period until the end of 2007.

This list of structural variables includes those labelled as *yearly* in the column 'periodicity' in Annex II of Commission Regulation (EC) 430/2005. This list includes 42 variables (six optional), plus the yearly weights.

The option of using a sub-sample to survey structural variables was introduced from 2006. Only seven countries, Spain, Germany, France, the Netherlands, Finland, the United Kingdom and Norway, took up this option in 2006 and/or 2007.

The extent to which a sub-sample is used varies widely from country to country. Spain surveyed nearly all 42 structural variables using only the yearly sub-sample. The Netherlands, the United Kingdom and Norway used a sub-sample for about half of the structural variables (Norway did not ask at all for eleven structural variables, thus limiting the number of structural variables which were in fact surveyed on the whole sample). Finland, Germany and France made limited use of a sub-sample. Finland used it for nine variables and Germany for four, whereas France used a sub-sample for six variables in 2006 and for one variable only — namely income — in 2007.

Annex III summarises the way in which the structural variables were covered by countries using a sub-sample in 2006 and 2007.

Annex I of Commission Regulation (EC) 430/2005 states the following conditions for using a sub-sample to collect data on structural variables:

²⁸ Portugal did not put the question about passive methods to persons who were looking for a job but only to those who were not searching.

1. Yearly/quarterly variables

The word 'yearly' in the 'Periodicity' column of the Codification laid down in Annex II, identifies structural variables which optionally need only to be surveyed as annual averages, using a sub-sample of independent observations with reference to 52 weeks, rather than as quarterly averages. Core variables to be surveyed each quarter are identified as 'quarterly'

All these countries spread the yearly sub-sample over the 52 weeks of the year, except Finland in 2006, which by derogation surveyed the five variables on the *situation one year before the survey* in the second quarter only, and the United Kingdom in both years which, by derogation, surveyed most of the structural variables in the second quarter and two in the fourth quarter.

2. Representativeness of the results

For structural variables, the relative standard error (without taking design effect into account) of any yearly estimate representing 1% or more of the working age population shall not exceed:

(a) 9% for countries with a population between 1 million and 20 million inhabitants and

(b) 5% for countries with a population of 20 million or more.

Countries with less than 1 million inhabitants are exempted from these precision requirements and structural variables should be collected for the total sample unless the sample meets requirements expressed in (a).

For countries using a sub-sample for data collection on structural variables, if more than one wave is used, the total sub-sample used shall consist of independent observations.

Of the seven countries using a sub-sample to survey structural variables in 2006 and 2007, Spain, France, Germany and the United Kingdom have more than 20 million inhabitants, whereas the Netherlands, Finland and Norway have a population of between 1 and 20 million. Considering a generic estimate of 1% of the working age population (15-74 years), none of those countries exceeded the above benchmark during the whole period.

For all countries using a sub-sample to survey structural variables, such sub-samples are made up of independent observations.

3. Consistency of totals

Consistency between annual sub-sample totals and full sample annual averages shall be ensured for employment, unemployment and inactive population by sex and for the following age groups: 15 to 24, 25 to 34, 35 to 44, 45 to 54, 55 +.

For estimates rounded to thousands, consistency of totals between the annual sub-sample totals and the full sample annual averages was ensured by Norway, Spain (with the exception of inactives aged 15-24, both males and females) and Finland in 2007.

For Finland in 2006 and the United Kingdom in both years, the annual sub-sample totals were consistent with estimates from the second quarter. For Germany, France and the Netherlands, totals were different for nearly all of the thirty clusters (three employment statuses multiplied by two genders and five age groups), in both 2006 and 2007.

Table 12. Differences between yearly sub-samples and annual averages of full yearly samples (x1000) — Countries spreading the annual sub-sample over 52 weeks

Employment status	Sex	Age group	2006					2007					
			DE	ES	FR	NL	NO	DE	ES	FR	NL	FI	NO
Employed	Males	15-24	7	0	40	-11	0	-1	0	23	-23	0	0
		25-34	1	0	-89	-7	0	-7	0	-31	-1	0	0
		35-44	6	0	-67	-7	0	2	0	-44	-8	0	0
		45-54	-21	0	0	-10	0	-11	0	-6	-9	0	0
		55+	-3	0	-1	1	0	1	0	21	-13	0	0
	Females	15-24	-7	0	33	-26	0	-12	0	55	-27	0	0
		25-34	11	0	-11	-6	0	17	0	-4	-4	0	0
		35-44	-26	0	5	-11	0	4	0	7	-4	0	0
		45-54	-9	0	-12	-11	0	1	0	-8	-5	0	0
		55+	-6	0	0	1	0	1	0	-34	-6	0	0
Unemployed	Males	15-24	1	0	3	7	0	2	0	4	7	0	0
		25-34	0	0	36	4	0	1	0	55	1	0	0
		35-44	0	0	57	3	0	2	0	22	5	0	0
		45-54	1	0	11	6	0	0	0	-12	2	0	0
		55+	-2	0	10	4	0	1	0	-24	5	0	0
	Females	15-24	1	0	11	10	0	1	0	-10	10	0	0
		25-34	-2	0	27	3	0	-5	0	1	-1	0	0
		35-44	0	0	13	6	0	2	0	2	1	0	0
		45-54	1	0	9	2	0	1	0	6	4	0	0
		55+	3	0	4	4	0	0	0	-2	1	0	0
Inactive	Males	15-24	9	-13	-49	4	0	13	8	-21	16	0	0
		25-34	-19	0	31	4	0	7	0	-17	1	0	0
		35-44	-9	0	16	3	0	2	0	0	3	0	0
		45-54	-12	0	-21	4	0	-5	0	15	7	0	0
		55+	-38	0	9	-6	0	-15	0	7	8	0	0
	Females	15-24	-27	-11	-70	15	0	0	-9	-19	16	0	0
		25-34	-9	0	-4	3	0	-1	0	-18	6	0	0
		35-44	-6	0	-27	4	0	4	0	12	3	0	0
		45-54	-4	0	8	9	0	-3	0	13	2	0	0
		55+	-6	0	-3	-5	0	-11	0	27	5	0	0

Source: EU-LFS

4. Ad hoc modules

The sample used to collect information on ad hoc modules shall also provide information on structural variables

In general, participating countries respected this requirement, with the exception of Finland in 2006 and the United Kingdom and France in 2006 and 2007. Finland and the United Kingdom carried out the ad hoc modules on all fifty-two weeks of the year, whereas some structural variables were only collected in the second quarter. France surveyed both the structural variables and the ad hoc modules with reference to the whole year, but on different sub-samples.

Table 13. Structural variables not included in the ad hoc module datasets

Country	Year	Variables
---------	------	-----------

Table 13. Structural variables not included in the ad hoc module datasets

Country	Year	Variables
France	2006	WSTAT1Y, STAPRO1Y, NACE1Y2D, COUNTR1Y, REGION1Y, INCMON
	2007	WSTAT1Y, STAPRO1Y, NACE1Y2D, COUNTR1Y, REGION1Y, INCMON
Finland	2006	WSTAT1Y, STAPRO1Y, NACE1Y2D, COUNTR1Y, REGION1Y
United Kingdom	2006	FTPTREAS, SHIFTWK, EVENWK, NIGHTWK, SATWK, SUNWK, HOMEWK, SEEKREAS, NEEDCARE, WSTAT1Y, STAPRO1Y, NACE1Y2D, COUNTR1Y, REGION1Y
	2007	FTPTREAS, SHIFTWK, EVENWK, NIGHTWK, SATWK, SUNWK, HOMEWK, SEEKREAS, NEEDCARE, WSTAT1Y, STAPRO1Y, NACE1Y2D, COUNTR1Y, REGION1Y

Source: EU-LFS

5. ARTICLE 5 — CONDUCT OF THE SURVEY

5.1. *The Member States may make it compulsory to reply to the survey.*

Participation in the LFS is compulsory in thirteen participating countries (Belgium, Germany, Greece, Spain, France, Italy, Cyprus, Malta, Austria, Portugal, Slovakia, Turkey and Norway), but voluntary in 20 participating countries.

6. ARTICLE 6 — TRANSMISSION OF THE RESULTS

6.1. *Within twelve weeks of the end of the reference period in the case of a continuous survey (and within nine months of the end of the reference period in the case of a survey in the spring), the Member States shall forward to Eurostat the results of the survey, without direct identifiers.*

The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey started delivering microdata to Eurostat with the 2006 datasets, bringing the number of countries providing microdata to 33. In 2006, thirty countries delivered four quarterly datasets²⁹, whereas Croatia delivered two semi-annual datasets and Switzerland one annual dataset. From 2007 also Croatia has delivered four quarterly datasets. In total, Eurostat received 127 datasets for 2006 and 129 for 2007.

Overall, 63 datasets were on time in 2006 (49.6 %) and 87 in 2007 (67.4 %). In 2006, only five countries consistently met the deadline (cells with grey background in table 14). This number rose to fourteen in 2007.

²⁹ Indeed, in 2006 Luxembourg sent the same annual dataset for all four quarters.

Only Spain and Portugal always delivered microdata on time for all quarters of 2006 and 2007. At the other end of the scale, Malta, Croatia, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Iceland were consistently late in sending data during both years, while Belgium, Ireland, Italy, Turkey and Switzerland³⁰ were late for all 2006 deliveries.

Table 14. Number of weeks from deadline when data suitable for dissemination were delivered to Eurostat. Years 2006-2007¹

Country	2006				2007			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Belgium	3	1	4	1	6	3	T	3
Bulgaria	1	T	T	T	T	T	T	T
Czech Republic	1	T	T	T	T	T	T	T
Denmark	T	T	T	T	4	1	T	2
Germany	14	1	T	1	T	T	T	T
Estonia	2	2	T	T	T	T	T	T
Ireland	2	1	2	3	6	3	T	5
Greece	1	1	T	T	T	T	T	1
Spain	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T
France	9	2	12	T	T	T	T	T
Italy	9	4	3	1	2	1	T	T
Cyprus	T	1	T	T	T	T	T	T
Latvia	1	1	T	T	T	T	T	T
Lithuania	T	T	T	T	T	1	T	2
Luxembourg ²	39	26	13	T	14	1	T	T
Hungary	3	T	T	T	T	T	T	T
Malta	2	4	3	1	1	3	3	1
Netherlands	1	T	T	T	T	T	T	T
Austria	1	T	T	T	T	T	T	T
Poland	4	1	T	T	T	T	T	T
Portugal	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T
Romania	4	T	T	T	3	T	T	T
Slovenia	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	1
Slovakia	3	T	T	T	1	T	T	T
Finland	2	T	T	1	1	T	T	T
Sweden	4	1	T	T	4	1	T	T
United Kingdom	2	T	5	T	1	T	T	T
Croatia	-	12	-	10	23	18	7	11
Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	109	96	83	70	89	76	63	50
Turkey	48	38	25	12	T	T	T	4
Iceland	7	48	35	8	1	54	42	28
Norway	2	1	T	T	T	1	11	T
Switzerland	-	9	-	-	-	T	-	-

Note: Each week begun after the deadline is counted as 1 week. T denotes delivery on or before the deadline (12 weeks after end of each reference quarter, or 9 months after end of the second quarter in the case of an annual survey). Hyphen '-' denotes that a country did not carry out the LFS in the respective quarter. The grey background highlights an on-time delivery for all datasets of a year.

¹ The delays may reflect the date of transmission of the first correct (accepted) file, rather than the date of the very first transmission of a file.

² In 2006 the same annual dataset was sent for all four quarters.

Source: EU-LFS

³⁰ The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey started data transmission with the 2006 datasets. Switzerland, carrying out an annual survey, only transmitted one dataset.

7. ARTICLE 7 — REPORTS

7.1. *A report on the implementation of this Regulation shall be submitted by the Commission to the Parliament and the Council every three years, beginning in the year 2000. This report shall evaluate in particular the quality of the statistical methods envisaged by the Member States to improve the results or to lighten the survey procedures.*

The European Labour Force Survey is the largest sample survey in Europe. In an average quarter in 2007, Eurostat received data for over 1.5 million individuals aged 15 and older. Table 15 lists major design changes in the period 2006-2007 and the planned changes in the next three-year period.

Table 15. Major changes in the survey design 2006-2007 or changes planned by participating countries in 2008-2013

Country	Short description of the changes	Date when implemented
<i>All</i>	Introduction of six new characteristics, according to Council Regulation 2257/2003.	2006
	Implementation of NACE Rev 2.	2008
	Introduction of variable on Income, according to Council Regulation 1372/2007.	2009
<i>Belgium</i>	Sample size increased 25 % to about 15 000 households each quarter.	2006
	Gradual move from PAPI to CAPI (30 % of CAPI in 2007).	2007
<i>Bulgaria</i>	Introduced a new LFS questionnaire the first quarter of 2006.	2006
	Implementation of the wave approach.	2008
<i>Denmark</i>	Sample size more than doubled, rotation scheme changed to 2-(2)-2, more efficient use of auxiliary variables in weighting procedures, face-to-face interviewing used as supplementary method of collecting data.	2007
	Collection and transmission of household variables on a quarterly basis.	2010
<i>Germany</i>	Implementation of the wave approach.	2006
	Questionnaire changed to better capture ILO employment.	2007
	Questionnaire changed to align with principles 2 and 3 (inclusion of the questions regarding the duration of the absence and the continued receipt of salary; addition of a cue mentioning a minor or marginal job in the question on job search).	2008
<i>Estonia</i>	Sample size increased from 2 500 to 3 000 households each quarter.	2007
<i>Spain</i>	Implementation of the wave approach.	2006
<i>France</i>	Implementation of the wave approach.	2006
	Questionnaire changed to fully implement the definition of unemployment. Weighting procedure from NUTS II. Supplementary non-response survey to collect data from non-respondents.	2007
	Gradual enlargement of the survey sample, up to 50 % more than at present.	2009
	Implementation of the continuous survey in the Overseas Territories (DOM).	2013
<i>Ireland</i>	Redesign of questionnaire.	2006
	Move to calendar quarters.	2009
<i>Italy</i>	Questionnaire changed so 'Availability to work within 2 weeks' now starts from reference week rather than interview week, in line with principle 6.	2006
<i>Latvia</i>	LFS was changed from PAPI to CAPI. Change of questionnaire to align to Principle 2	2006
	Sample size more than doubled. Rotation scheme changed to 2-(2)-2, more efficient use of auxiliary variables in weighting procedure and 'contact with the public employment office to find work' is asked first in the list of job search methods, CATI interviewing introduced in combination with CAPI.	2007
	Improve calculation of weights to improve consistency between sampling frame and target population regarding the treatment of collective households. Redesign of questionnaire to align to principles 3, 6 and 10.	2010
<i>Lithuania</i>	Questionnaire adapted to EU-LFS list of variables.	2006
	Sample (households) increased of about 35 %. CAPI used from quarter IV 2007 in combination with PAPI.	2007
	Redesign of questionnaire to align to principles 2, 3 and 6.	2010
<i>Hungary</i>	Move to cover all the weeks of the quarter.	2006
<i>Malta</i>	Weighting scheme changed to correct for non-response in second wave.	2006

Table 15. Major changes in the survey design 2006-2007 or changes planned by participating countries in 2008-2013

Country	Short description of the changes	Date when implemented
	Quarterly sample size increased from 2500 to 3200 households.	2007
	Rotation scheme changed from 2- to 2-(2)-2.	2008
<i>Netherlands</i>	Use of CATI also in the first wave (in replacement of CAPI) for sampled households whose telephone number is available.	2010
<i>Austria</i>	Replacement of PAPI with CAPI for first wave interviews.	2006
<i>Poland</i>	Change of questionnaire to align to Regulation 430/2005 and the 12 principles. Variable MAINSTAT introduced. Introduction of CAPI supplementing PAPI.	2006
	Increase of the sample size in the 7 NUTS 2 areas not meeting the precision requirements. Improved population estimates taking migration into account.	2008
	Change of the questionnaire to further align to the definition of unemployment and the 12 principles (better specification of reference periods of job search and current availability; one hour jobs mentioned in the question on labour status).	2009
	Sample doubled to meet precision requirements for estimates of change. Introduction of information on interview week.	2010
<i>Romania</i>	Move to full and uniform coverage of the weeks of the quarter.	2006
<i>Slovenia</i>	Move to a more uniform distribution of sample and coverage of all weeks of the quarter.	2006
	Question on Main status moved to the end of questionnaire, in line with principle 1.	2007
<i>Finland</i>	Implementation of the wave approach.	2007
	Extension of the wave approach. Redesign of the questionnaire to align to Regulation 430/2005.	2008
<i>Sweden</i>	Implementation of household sub-sample data with weights.	2010
<i>United Kingdom</i>	Move to calendar quarters.	2006
	Change of residency rules, in order to improve coverage of short-term migrants and temporary foreign workers. Implementation of the wave approach.	2008
<i>Croatia</i>	Move to a continuous survey, data available at NUTS II level, quarterly results available, yearly sample size doubled, rotation scheme changed to 2-(2)-2.	2007
<i>Turkey</i>	Delivery of micro-data.	2006
<i>Norway</i>	Redesign of questionnaire for improved EU comparability (alignment to principles 6, 7, 9, 11 and 12). Lower age limit moved to 15. Implementation of the wave approach.	2006
<i>Switzerland</i>	Move to a continuous survey.	2010

Sources: Quality Reports and communications from Member States

ANNEX I — PRINCIPLES FOR FORMULATING THE QUESTIONS ON LABOUR STATUS

YEAR	2007	BE	BG	CZ	DK	DE	EE	EL	ES
1	The questions on the labour status - are in general the first questions on the individual questionnaire - immediately follow the questions on the demographic characteristics of the household members - are not preceded by questions on the main or the usual activity - are not preceded by questions on the registration at the public employment office Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2	The sequence of questions on employment consists of at least two separate questions, - one on currently working - and another on having a job when being temporarily absent from work - and the question on being at work precedes the question on having a job The identification of lay-offs and their classification as employed (or unemployed) persons depends on two conditions of formal job attachment: - an assurance of return to work after the end of the contingency (- continues to receive 50% or more of the salary) - and the short duration (<=3 months) of the suspension of the labour contract Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3	The questions on employment - contain a cue for the identification of persons with a minor job a few or even one hour The questions on job search - contain a cue for the identification of persons with a minor job a few or even one hour Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
4	The questions on employment - contain a cue for the identification of unpaid family workers - unpaid family workers are identified by a separate question about being at work Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
5	The questions on employment - clearly indicate that only work for pay or profit is considered as an economic activity Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
6	The reference period of employment is clearly specified - as the last week, defined as 'from Monday to Sunday', giving the exact date The reference period of job search is clearly specified - as the past four weeks including the reference week The reference period of job search methods is clearly specified - as the past four weeks including the reference week The reference period of availability is clearly specified - as the period until the end of the two weeks following the reference week Is the principle respected?	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
7	All persons who were asked the questions on employment and were identified as having no job - are asked the question on job search Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
8	The question on job search - refers to any effort, even irregular, to find work, i.e. the wording does not suggest that only a continuous search throughout the entire reference period is considered as a sufficient condition for job search Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9	The question on job search methods contains - active search methods - and passive search methods Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
10	The 'contact with the public employment office to find work' - is included as the first (response category in the) question on job search methods - is distinct from the renewal of a registration to claim unemployment benefits - is distinct from the assistance provided by the employment office to improve the employability of the registered unemployed person Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
11	The questions on job search methods are asked - until at least three active methods are recorded as having been used by the respondent Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
12	For persons who are currently not employed and who are not looking for a job because they have already found a job which will start later - there exists a question on the starting date of that job (within 3 months/after more than 3 months) Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y

YEAR	2007	FR	IE	IT	CY	LV	LT	LU	HU
1	The questions on the labour status - are in general the first questions on the individual questionnaire - immediately follow the questions on the demographic characteristics of the household members - are not preceded by questions on the main or the usual activity - are not preceded by questions on the registration at the public employment office Is the principle respected?	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2	The sequence of questions on employment consists of at least two separate questions, - one on currently working - and another on having a job when being temporarily absent from work - and the question on being at work precedes the question on having a job The identification of lay-offs and their classification as employed (or unemployed) persons depends on two conditions of formal job attachment: - an assurance of return to work after the end of the contingency (- continues to receive 50% or more of the salary) - and the short duration (<=3 months) of the suspension of the labour contract Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3	The questions on employment - contain a cue for the identification of persons with a minor job a few or even one hour The questions on job search - contain a cue for the identification of persons with a minor job a few or even one hour Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
4	The questions on employment - contain a cue for the identification of unpaid family workers - unpaid family workers are identified by a separate question about being at work Is the principle respected?	Y	Y			Y			N
5	The questions on employment - clearly indicate that only work for pay or profit is considered as an economic activity Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6	The reference period of employment is clearly specified - as the last week, defined as 'from Monday to Sunday', giving the exact date The reference period of job search is clearly specified - as the past four weeks including the reference week The reference period of job search methods is clearly specified - as the past four weeks including the reference week The reference period of availability is clearly specified - as the period until the end of the two weeks following the reference week Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
7	All persons who were asked the questions on employment and were identified as having no job - are asked the question on job search Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
8	The question on job search - refers to any effort, even irregular, to find work, i.e. the wording does not suggest that only a continuous search throughout the entire reference period is considered as a sufficient condition for job search Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9	The question on job search methods contains - active search methods - and passive search methods Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
10	The 'contact with the public employment office to find work' - is included as the first (response category in the) question on job search methods - is distinct from the renewal of a registration to claim unemployment benefits - is distinct from the assistance provided by the employment office to improve the employability of the registered unemployed person Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
11	The questions on job search methods are asked - until at least three active methods are recorded as having been used by the respondent Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
12	For persons who are currently not employed and who are not looking for a job because they have already found a job which will start later - there exists a question on the starting date of that job (within 3 months/after more than 3 months) Is the principle respected?	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

YEAR	2007	MT	NL	AT	PL	PT	RO	SI	SK
1	The questions on the labour status - are in general the first questions on the individual questionnaire - immediately follow the questions on the demographic characteristics of the household members - are not preceded by questions on the main or the usual activity - are not preceded by questions on the registration at the public employment office Is the principle respected?	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
2	The sequence of questions on employment consists of at least two separate questions, - one on currently working - and another on having a job when being temporarily absent from work - and the question on being at work precedes the question on having a job The identification of lay-offs and their classification as employed (or unemployed) persons depends on two conditions of formal job attachment: - an assurance of return to work after the end of the contingency (- continues to receive 50% or more of the salary) - and the short duration (<=3 months) of the suspension of the labour contract Is the principle respected?	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
3	The questions on employment - contain a cue for the identification of persons with a minor job a few or even one hour The questions on job search - contain a cue for the identification of persons with a minor job a few or even one hour Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
4	The questions on employment - contain a cue for the identification of unpaid family workers - unpaid family workers are identified by a separate question about being at work Is the principle respected?	N	Y			Y		Y	
5	The questions on employment - clearly indicate that only work for pay or profit is considered as an economic activity Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6	The reference period of employment is clearly specified - as the last week, defined as 'from Monday to Sunday', giving the exact date The reference period of job search is clearly specified - as the past four weeks including the reference week The reference period of job search methods is clearly specified - as the past four weeks including the reference week The reference period of availability is clearly specified - as the period until the end of the two weeks following the reference week Is the principle respected?	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
7	All persons who were asked the questions on employment and were identified as having no job - are asked the question on job search Is the principle respected?	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
8	The question on job search - refers to any effort, even irregular, to find work, i.e. the wording does not suggest that only a continuous search throughout the entire reference period is considered as a sufficient condition for job search Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9	The question on job search methods contains - active search methods - and passive search methods Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
10	The 'contact with the public employment office to find work' - is included as the first (response category in the) question on job search methods - is distinct from the renewal of a registration to claim unemployment benefits - is distinct from the assistance provided by the employment office to improve the employability of the registered unemployed person Is the principle respected?	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
11	The questions on job search methods are asked - until at least three active methods are recorded as having been used by the respondent Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
12	For persons who are currently not employed and who are not looking for a job because they have already found a job which will start later - there exists a question on the starting date of that job (within 3 months/after more than 3 months) Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y

YEAR	2007	FI	SE	UK	HR	MK	TR	IS	NO	CH
1	The questions on the labour status - are in general the first questions on the individual questionnaire - immediately follow the questions on the demographic characteristics of the household members - are not preceded by questions on the main or the usual activity - are not preceded by questions on the registration at the public employment office Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2	The sequence of questions on employment consists of at least two separate questions, - one on currently working - and another on having a job when being temporarily absent from work - and the question on being at work precedes the question on having a job The identification of lay-offs and their classification as employed (or unemployed) persons depends on two conditions of formal job attachment: - an assurance of return to work after the end of the contingency <i>(- continues to receive 50% or more of the salary)</i> - and the short duration (<=3 months) of the suspension of the labour contract Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
3	The questions on employment - contain a cue for the identification of persons with a minor job a few or even one hour The questions on job search - contain a cue for the identification of persons with a minor job a few or even one hour Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
4	The questions on employment - contain a cue for the identification of unpaid family workers - unpaid family workers are identified by a separate question about being at work Is the principle respected?	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
5	The questions on employment - clearly indicate that only work for pay or profit is considered as an economic activity Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	N	N	P	P	P	Y	P
6	The reference period of employment is clearly specified - as the last week, defined as 'from Monday to Sunday', giving the exact date The reference period of job search is clearly specified - as the past four weeks including the reference week The reference period of job search methods is clearly specified - as the past four weeks including the reference week The reference period of availability is clearly specified - as the period until the end of the two weeks following the reference week Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N
7	All persons who were asked the questions on employment and were identified as having no job - are asked the question on job search Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
8	The question on job search - refers to any effort, even irregular, to find work, i.e. the wording does not suggest that only a continuous search throughout the entire reference period is considered as a sufficient condition for job search Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9	The question on job search methods contains - active search methods - and passive search methods Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
10	The 'contact with the public employment office to find work' - is included as the first (response category in the) question on job search methods - is distinct from the renewal of a registration to claim unemployment benefits - is distinct from the assistance provided by the employment office to improve the employability of the registered unemployed person Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N
11	The questions on job search methods are asked - until at least three active methods are recorded as having been used by the respondent Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
12	For persons who are currently not employed and who are not looking for a job because they have already found a job which will start later - there exists a question on the starting date of that job (within 3 months/after more than 3 months) Is the principle respected?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

ANNEX II — Imputation of relative standard error

Imputation of relative standard error for regional annual averages

$$\hat{c}_h = \sqrt{(1 - f_h) \hat{d}_h \frac{19\{1 + \frac{1}{2}(3o_{k,k+1}r_{h(k,k+1)} + 2o_{k,k+2}r_{h(k,k+2)} + o_{k,k+3}r_{h(k,k+3)})\}}{K(n_h - 1)}}$$

where $f_h = \frac{n_h}{\hat{N}_h}$ n_h is the annual average number of respondents aged 15-74 in region h , \hat{N}_h is the annual average of population aged 15-74 in region h as estimated from the LFS,

$$\hat{d}_h = \frac{p_h c_h^2 K(n_h - 1)}{(1 - f_h)(1 - p_h)\{1 + \frac{1}{2}(3o_{k,k+1}r_{h(k,k+1)} + 2o_{k,k+2}r_{h(k,k+2)} + o_{k,k+3}r_{h(k,k+3)})\}} \quad (\text{estimated design effect in region } h),$$

c_h is the coefficient of variation in region h as given by the Participating Country, p_h is the proportion of unemployed persons in region h (of all persons aged 15-74 in region h), K is the number of quarters (estimates) during the year, $o_{k,k+t}$ is the proportion of

sample overlapping between quarters k and $k+t$, $r_{h(k,k+t)} = \frac{p_{h(k,k+t)} - p_h^2}{p_h - p_h^2}$ (correlation of

unemployment between quarter k and $k+t$), $p_{h(k,k+t)}$ is the proportion of persons unemployed both in quarter k and $k+t$ as estimated from the characteristic duration of unemployment. When the coefficients of variation (c_h) are provided by countries, the equation for the relative

standard error reduces to $\hat{c}'_h = \sqrt{\frac{19p_h c_h^2}{1 - p_h}}$. If no variance data are available for the region for

one year, data for the previous or the following year are used (e.g. 2007 data as proxy for 2006 data and vice versa). If no data are available either for 2006 or for 2007, the design effect (average national quarterly estimates) as calculated below is assumed.

Imputation of relative standard error for change between 2 quarters

$$\hat{c}_{k,k+1} = \sqrt{(1 - f) \hat{d} \frac{38(1 - o_{k,k+1})}{\bar{n} - 1}}, \text{ where } f = \frac{\bar{n}}{\hat{N}}, \hat{d} = \frac{\bar{p}\bar{c}^2(\bar{n} - 1)}{(1 - f)(1 - \bar{p})}, \text{ and } \bar{c} \text{ is the average of}$$

the quarterly coefficients provided by the participating countries and \bar{p} is the average number of unemployed persons during the year divided by the estimated average population aged 15-74. If no coefficients are provided, a design effect of 2 is assumed. When the coefficients of variation (c_q) are provided by countries, the equation for the relative standard error reduces to

$$\hat{c}'_{k,k+1} = \sqrt{\frac{38\bar{p}\bar{c}^2(1 - o_{k,k+1})}{1 - \bar{p}}}.$$

ANNEX III – Implementation of a yearly sub-sample to survey structural variables

STRUCTURAL VARIABLES	Germany				Spain				France			
	2006		2007		2006		2007		2006		2007	
	quar- ters	waves	quar- ters	waves	quar- ters	waves	quar- ters	waves	quar- ters	waves	quar- ters	waves
Relationship to reference person	all	all	all	all	all	6	all	6	all	all	all	all
Sequence number of spouse	all	all	all	all	all	6	all	6	all	all	all	all
Sequence number of father	all	all	all	all	all	6	all	6	all	all	all	all
Sequence number of mother	all	all	all	all	all	6	all	6	all	all	all	all
Marital status	all	all	all	all	all	6	all	6	all	all	all	all
Years of residence in the country	all	all	all	all	all	6 until Q3.	all	all	all	all	all	all
Supervisory responsibilities	all	10% of total sample	all	10% of total sample	all	6	all	6	all	all	all	all
Number of persons working at the local unit	all	all	all	all	all	6	all	6	all	all	all	all
Involvement of public employment service in finding the current job	all	10% of total sample	all	10% of total sample	all	6	all	6	all	all	all	all
Reasons for part-time work	all	all	all	all	all	6	all	6	all	all	all	all
Reasons for temporary job	all	all	all	all	all	6	all	6	all	all	all	all
Contract with a temporary employment agency	all	10% of total sample	all	10% of total sample	all	6	all	6	all	all	all	all
Shift work	all	all	all	all	all	6	all	6	all	all	all	all
Evening work	all	all	all	all	all	6	all	6	all	all	all	all
Night work	all	all	all	all	all	6	all	6	all	all	all	all
Saturday work	all	all	all	all	all	6	all	6	all	all	all	all
Sunday work	all	all	all	all	all	6	all	6	all	all	all	all
Way a person wants to work more hours	all	all	all	all	all	6	all	6	all	all	all	all
Working at home	all	all	all	all	all	6	all	6	all	all	all	all
Reasons for looking for another job	all	all	all	all	all	6	all	6	all	all	all	all
Main reason for leaving last job or business	all	all	all	all	all	6	all	6	all	all	all	all
Professional status in last job	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all
Economic activity of local unit in which person last worked	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all
Occupation of last job	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	not surveyed	not surveyed	not surveyed	not surveyed
Reasons why person has not sought work	all	all	all	all	all	6	all	6	all	all	all	all
Reasons for not being available to start work within 2 weeks	all	all	all	all	all	6	all	6	all	all	all	all
Situation of person immediately before starting to seek employment	all	all	all	all	all	6	all	6	not surveyed	not surveyed	not surveyed	not surveyed
Lack of care facilities	all	10% of total sample	all	10% of total sample	all	6	all	6	all	all	all	all
Registration at public employment office	all	all	all	all	all	6	all	6	all	all	all	all
Main status (optional)	not surveyed		not surveyed		all	6	all	6	all	all	all	all
Field of education in the last 4 weeks (optional)	not surveyed		not surveyed		all	6	all	6	all	all	all	all
Purpose of the most recent course (optional)	all	all	all	all	all	6	all	6	all	all	all	all
Field of the most recent taught activity (optional)	all	all	all	all	all	6	all	6	all	all	all	all
Most recent taught activity during working hours (optional)	not surveyed		not surveyed		not surveyed		not surveyed		all	all	all	all
Field of highest level of education completed	all	all	all	all	all	6	all	6	all	all	all	all
Year when highest level of education was completed	all	all	all	all	all	6	all	6	all	all	all	all
Main labour status one year before	all	all	all	all	all	6	all	6	all	1	all	all
Professional status one year before	all	all	all	all	all	6	all	6	all	1	all	all
Economic activity of local unit in which person was working one year before	all	all	all	all	all	6	all	6	all	1	all	all
Country of residence one year before	all	all	all	all	all	6	all	6	all	1	all	all
Region of residence one year before	all	all	all	all	all	6	all	6	all	1	all	all
Monthly pay from main job (optional)	not surveyed		not surveyed		not surveyed		not surveyed		all	1 and 6	all	1 and 6

STRUCTURAL VARIABLES	Netherlands				Finland				United Kingdom				Norway			
	2006		2007		2006		2007		2006		2007		2006		2007	
	quar- ters	waves	quar- ters	waves	quar- ters	waves	quar- ters	waves	quar- ters	waves	quar- ters	waves	quar- ters	waves	quar- ters	waves
Relationship to reference person	all	all	all	all	all	5	all	5	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all
Sequence number of spouse	all	all	all	all	all	5	all	5	all	all	all	all	all	all	not surveyed	
Sequence number of father	all	all	all	all	all	5	all	5	all	all	all	all	all	all	not surveyed	
Sequence number of mother	all	all	all	all	all	5	all	5	all	all	all	all	all	all	not surveyed	
Marital status	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all
Years of residence in the country	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all
Supervisory responsibilities	all	1	all	1	not surveyed		not surveyed		all	all	all	all	not surveyed		not surveyed	
Number of persons working at the local unit	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all
Involvement of public employment service in finding the current job	all	1	all	1	not surveyed		not surveyed		all	all	all	all	all	1 and 8	all	1 and 8
Reasons for part-time work	all	1	all	1	all	all	all	all	2	all	2	all	all	1 and 8	all	1 and 8
Reasons for temporary job	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	1 and 8	all	1 and 8
Contract with a temporary employment agency	all	all	all	all	not surveyed		not surveyed		all	all	all	all	all	1 and 8	all	1 and 8
Shift work	all	1	all	1	all	all	all	all	2	all	2	all	all	1 and 8	all	1 and 8
Evening work	all	1	all	1	all	all	all	all	2	all	2	all	all	1 and 8	all	1 and 8
Night work	all	1	all	1	all	all	all	all	2	all	2	all	all	1 and 8	all	1 and 8
Saturday work	all	1	all	1	all	all	all	all	2	all	2	all	all	1 and 8	all	1 and 8
Sunday work	all	1	all	1	all	all	all	all	2	all	2	all	all	1 and 8	all	1 and 8
Way a person wants to work more hours	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	1 and 8	all	1 and 8
Working at home	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	2	all	2	all	all	1 and 8	all	1 and 8
Reasons for looking for another job	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	2	all	2	all	all	1 and 8	all	1 and 8
Main reason for leaving last job or business	all	1	all	1	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	1 and 8	all	1 and 8
Professional status in last job	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all
Economic activity of local unit in which person last worked	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	1 and 8	all	1 and 8
Occupation of last job	not surveyed		not surveyed		all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	1 and 8	all	1 and 8
Reasons why person has not sought work	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	4	all	4	all	all	1 and 8	all	1 and 8
Reasons for not being available to start work within 2 weeks	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	1 and 8	all	1 and 8
Situation of person immediately before starting to seek employment	all	1	all	1	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	1 and 8	all	1 and 8
Lack of care facilities	all	1	all	1	not surveyed		not surveyed		4	all	4	all	all	1 and 8	all	1 and 8
Registration at public employment office	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	not surveyed		not surveyed	
Main status (optional)	all	1	all	1	all	all	all	all	not surveyed		not surveyed		not surveyed		not surveyed	
Field of education in the last 4 weeks (optional)	all	all	all	all	not surveyed		not surveyed		all	all	all	all	not surveyed		not surveyed	
Purpose of the most recent course (optional)	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	not surveyed		not surveyed	
Field of the most recent taught activity (optional)	all	all	all	all	not surveyed		not surveyed		all	all	all	all	not surveyed		not surveyed	
Most recent taught activity during working hours (optional)	all	1	all	1	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	not surveyed		not surveyed	
Field of highest level of education completed	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	1 and 8	all	1 and 8
Year when highest level of education was completed	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	all	not surveyed		not surveyed	
Main labour status one year before	all	1	all	1	2	all	all	5	2	all	2	all	all	1 and 8	all	1 and 8
Professional status one year before	all	1	all	1	2	all	all	5	2	all	2	all	all	1 and 8	all	1 and 8
Economic activity of local unit in which person was working one year before	all	1	all	1	2	all	all	5	2	all	2	all	all	1 and 8	all	1 and 8
Country of residence one year before	all	1	all	1	2	all	all	5	2	all	2	all	not surveyed		not surveyed	
Region of residence one year before	all	1	all	1	2	all	all	5	2	all	2	all	not surveyed		not surveyed	
Monthly pay from main job (optional)	not surveyed		not surveyed		not surveyed		not surveyed		not surveyed		not surveyed		not surveyed		not surveyed	