Comment template for theme 'Statistical Units'

	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Id[1]	Name	Chapter, section or clause no./ Subclause No./ Annex[2]	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note[3]	Type of com-ment[4]	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change[5]	WG A observations on each comment submitted
1	IGN F	Title		E	Acronym of INSPIRE theme present on title for SU (but not for other themes)	Delete acronym	?? I don't see INSPIRE in the title of cover page 1.
2	NLS Sweden	Whole document		G	No further comments from Sweden		Many thanks
3	IGN F	Whole document		E	Style of titles is not the same as in other deliverables. (Eurostat recommended WG A to have more homogeneous documents)	Adopt same styles as for other deliverables.	I don't have the expertise or help assistance for this task.
4	IGNF	1	Last paragraphs	E	The part related to theme SU is rather short.	Think about expending a bit more the summary of main decisions.	If anything is missing, maybe short is better.
5	DG REGIO	2,4		E	Update of terminology: replace LUZ (obsolete) by FUA	FUA = Functional Urban Area (supra-municipal area containing a city and its surrounding commuting area, defined by Eurostat)	OK. Sorry
6	IGNF	3.1	NOTE 1	E	"Examples of this statistical information related to SDGs are: …" There might probably be other examples.	Rephrase. For instance "Examples of this statistical information related to SDGs include: .."	OK.
7	IGNF	3.1	NOTE 2	E	"Point and line could also be used as statistical units" Plural might be better	Replace by "Points and lines could also be used as statistical units"	OK
8	IGNF	3.1	NOTE 2	E	"but the lowest levels of Statistical Units may be smaller than lowest level of Administrative Units (corresponding generally to municipalities)."	"but the lowest levels of Statistical Units may be smaller than the lowest level of Administrative Units (corresponding generally to municipalities)."looks better	OK. Thanks

---

[1] For internal use only. Not to be completed by reviewers.
[2] Use "3.1" instead of "Clause 3.1" or "Chapter 6.1". This makes grouping of comments easier.
[3] E.g., Table 1
[4] Type of comment can be G (general), E (editorial), T (technical), or Q (question)
[5] The proposed change must be as precise and concrete as possible.

9	Eurostat	3.1	NOTE 4	G	The sentence "the statistical units not properly contain statistical data or figure, but they are the bridge to link all the published statistical information to their pertinent geometry" is ambiguous. The stat unit is not "the bridge to the geometry", it is the geometry itself.	Replace with simply: "The statistical units are geometrical representations of the locations on which statistics are reported."	OK. Sentence accepted opening the paragraph, but proposed replacement is maintained, as useful explanation, with small changes.
10	Eurostat	3.1	NOTE 5	G	The scope is not on the location of unit records (aka "micro data") but on the aggregated figures, the statistics.	No change is needed. The notion of "micro data" could be mentioned.	OK. Comment not well understand, but the phrase was remake and a mention to micro-data is added.
11	Eurostat	3.2		G	This section is maybe too long and not so useful. There is not such need to describe the usefulness of statistics. It should be an assumption for anyone reading this document.	Remove or keep it short. "Statistics, in various domain, is a key information for decision makers". This sentence might be sufficient.	NOT removed. The geospatial community and Dominique Laurent say that it's important for not statistical professionals.
12	IGN F	3.2	Paragraph above figure 1	E	"to understand nearly any phenomenon at every stages of knowledge approach" "The next image draft a short summary overview" Spelling errors	Replace by "to understand nearly any phenomenon at every stage of knowledge approach" "The next image drafts a short summary overview"	OK
13	Eurostat	3.2	Section on GSGF	G	The GSGF is not a use case of statistical units.	This part should be moved in another section, maybe in annex.	NO. Strictly speaking GSGF is not a singular use case, but their statements recognise multiple and important users and use case. Nevertheless is too short for be a separates Annex
14	Eurostat	4.1.1	First paragraph		This paragraph gives justifications for using grid statistical units. One of the main reasons, which is not mentioned here is to overcome the bias introduced when using SUs with heterogeneous sizes and shapes - the MAUP (Modifiable Areal Unit Problem).	The MAUP should be mentioned as (one of) the main motivations for using statistical grids.	OK: added

15	Eurostat	4.1.1	NOTE 1	G	"A grid size of 1km2 is considered an optimal choice of statistical unit, as a good compromise between more detailed information (smaller area) and less confidentiality issues" This is correct for population grids, but does not apply to all stat domains. The optimal grid size depends on the statistical variable. 1km² is too detailed for some statistical domains, while not detailed for others	Remove the note or replace with: "The optimum grid size depend on the statistical variable and the required confidentiality level. 1km resolution is for example considered as optimal for population statistics".	OK, replaced
16	Eurostat	4.1.1	NOTE 2	G	"For the over-sea territories, it is recommended to use a grid based on the LAEA projection and on an ITRS based datum". The LAEA projection is not suitable for (most) over-sea territories.	Replace with: "For over-sea territories, it is recommended to use a grid based on an equal-area projection and on an ITRS based datum" ?	OK, replaced
17	IGN F	4.1.1	NOTE 1 after GP1	T	As WG A is not recommended a standard grid size, it might be worth to say explicitly that the choice of grid size is up to Member States (likely choice of the NSI).	Possibly, add a sentence on this topic.	NO. As open field could be an option taken from Member States, for a group of countries or a recommendation from international bodies. I think is better not made additional recommendations.
18	DG REGIO	4.1.2		E	Clarify the meaning of the first sentence of NOTE 2 of core recommendation 2	The advantage of territorial units based on administrative levels is that most of these administrative levels are publicly well-known and familiar for the dissemination of national statistics.	OK
19	DG REGIO	4.1.2		E	Update the reference to LAU under NOTE 3 of core recommendation 2 (only one LAU level still exists)	… that includes NUTS1, NUTS2, NUTS3 and the LAU level. Principle of NUTS classification is to have a common set of Statistical Units by level, with the best compromise of equilibrium between maintaining the administrative and statistical units of the country and having units with similar (wide) ranges of population.	OK. Thanks
20	DG REGIO	4.1.2		E	Correct the terminology on EU city concepts under core recommendation 3	NOTE 2: In the European Union, the set of urban standardised statistical units include cities, greater cities and functional urban areas (FUA)	OK
21	Eurostat	4.1.2	NOTE 3	E,G	"that includes (…) LAU1 and LAU2" LAU1 and LAU2 do not exist anymore: They have been replaced by a single LAU level.	Replace with "that includes (…) LAU"	OK, replaced. Sorry for the mistake.

22	NSI Lithuania	4.1.2	GP2	G	Enumeration districts are based on the number of inhabitants there, so enumeration districts are not stable territorial units, they are changed during every census, so they are not usable for dissemination; they are not official statistical units.	Remove the term "enumeration districts" from the "Theme Statistical Units (SU), Recommendation for content" and don't consider them as statistical units.	NO. It's a big issue, but after a wide round of consultation (describe in 8. Annex B, pp. 27-28) a majority of NSI are in favour of include Enumeration Districts. Any Statistical or Administrative unit change across time, but nevertheless the Enumeration Districts is a useful system of units for dissemination the statistical information in most of the countries.
23	Eurostat	4.1.3	NOTE	Q	**"in other words, statistical units of the past are not considered as core data".** **This implies that statistics reported on past SUs will no longer be usable. The current practice in such case is to recalculate past stats on the new SUs.** **This should be linked with section 6.4.**	**Add as a precision: "When statistical units change and the past statistical units stop being available, statistical variables should be recalculated on the new statistical units. This is crucial to keep providing long statistical time series".**	**PARTIALY OK. Cross reference added. Text proposed not added. The precision is explained in deep in the 6.4 section and a mention of that is added in this point.**
24	IGN F	4.1.3	CR 7	E	**"the versioning system will be recommended for all statistical units of the territory beyond 2020"** **The recommendation is done now.**	**Possibly, replace by "the versioning system is recommended for all statistical units of the territory beyond 2020"**	**OK**
25	Eurostat	4.2		G	**Providing different generalisation levels for SU is indeed important. Simplified versions for statistical maps are required.**	**No change: Keep it.** **The link with section 6.3 could be improved.**	**OK. A mention to 6.3 is added.**
26	Eurostat	4.3		T	**Lake Constanz is part of NUTS – Reference should be removed**		**OK, removed**
27	Eurostat	4.4		G	**Good practices report need for "great care" and "convenient thematic identifier" which sounds imprecise.**	**The recommendations should be more precise. Please rephrase relying on existing data quality terminology: Positional accuracy, topological consistency, persistence and unicity of identifier, etc. See other UNGGIM:Europe Recommendations**	**OK. Added in GP 4 and 6. Topological consistency is in the CR 11 (stronger than a good practice)**
28	Eurostat	4.5.1		G	**Edge-matching should be considered here.**		**OK. Mention to 6.3 is added**
29	Eurostat	4.5.1			**Big Lakes are part of administrative regions.**	**Remove this part referring to big lakes.**	**OK, removed**

30	IGNF	5.2	GP8 and following NOTE	T	We recommend to apply INSPIRE Technical guidelines and we explain it is a legal obligation for EU. This is not completely true as only Implementing Rules are mandatory.	Modify the NOTE	?? I don't understand which is your specific proposal of modification.
31	Eurostat	5.3		G	"It is expected that core data will be made available through improved existing products (or new products) or as INSPIRE data, and perhaps as specific core products (delivery issues still have to be investigated by the working group)". This could be clarified.	Remove or give precision on which existing products are considered, EBM certainly?	NO changes. It's a broader and open issue, with no consensus about it.
32	IGNF	5.3	GP9 and following NOTE	T	Idem Comment 30	Modify the NOTE	?? Same difficulties.
33	DG REGIO	6.2.1		E	Drafting revision	This standard classification ensures that Territorial Units of the same level represent the best compromise of equilibrium between maintaining the administrative and statistical units of the country and having units with similar (wide) ranges of population.	OK
34	Eurostat	6.3	Title (and content)	G	Edge-matching is not the only challenge for getting pan-European data. Geometrical harmonisation with generalisation is the other big challenge.	Change title with "Getting pan-European data – edge-matching and generalisation" or "Getting pan-European data – edge-matching and geometrical harmonisation"	OK. Second option is selected for the change.
35	Eurostat	6.3	Second paragraph	G	Several investigations have already taken place and the bottlenecks to speed-up ERM production are well identified: EBM production should adopt an incremental updating approach instead of the tedious "snapshot model" currently in place. This would require simply the setting up of a central data repository which will be accessed by each member state to update (maybe continuously and automatically?) the data related to their territories. This production model is in fact already in place in several MSs between local and national levels, and should also be applied between national and European level.	Add: "Significant improvements could be achieved by adopting an incremental updating approach. In such approach, a central data repository is accessed by each member state to update (maybe continuously and automatically) the data related to their territories. This production model is already in place in several Member States between local and national levels, and should also be applied between national and European level".	OK. Added
36	Hugo Poelman	6,3		E	Revise the drafting in the second paragraph: the speed of the production process can be improved by producers, not really by users	Therefore, data producers of this product are encouraged to investigate the possible ways to speed up the process	OK
37	Eurostat	6.4	First sentence	G	"This historical data may be required in some use cases" Access to historical statistics (aka "long time series" in statisticians' terminology) is crucial in most statistical domains.	Correct with: "This historical data is required in most use cases".	OK. Correction added as "many", without implying any evaluation of statistical weight of use cases that need or not need historical data (very difficult to achieve).

38	Eurostat	6.4	2 last paragraph	G	The operations described here should not be addressed by the user, but by the NSI. Statistics recalculation or resampling should be mentioned here.	Remove or clarify who and how will address that. Maybe the NSIs.	NO changes in a difficult part many times rewritten across the last years. The users receive the information mentioned in the paragraph "Firs step…" The recalculation and other procedures is considered in the paragraph "Second Step.
39	Eurostat	6.4 and 4.1.3		G	Paragraphs 6.4 and 4.1.3 could be merged or better reference each other.	Merge paragraph or better reference each other.	NO. Many attempts were done, thinking it should be understandable by geographical community
40	Eurostat	6.4		E	Extra dot in 3 paragraph, first sentence		OK. Sorry
41	Eurostat	6.4		E	Suggestion to remove 3, 4 and 5 paragraph – it has nothing to do with recommendation for content	remove	NO. The paragraphs want to clarify some key aspects of time-tracking and historical statistical units.
42	IGN F	6.4	3rd paragraph	E	"The second case for general users is displaying statistical data on fixed geometries across time. .." One point would be enough	Correct	OK. Sorry
43	IGN F	6.4	4th paragraph	T	"Core Recommendation 4 and 7 and Good Practice 2 and 3 are the base for the purpose of a precise time tracking, and allow users for knowing all changes in statistical units at any moment and across time." I am not sure about the last part of the sentence. To know all changes, WG A should have recommended (at least) the Evolution part of INSPIRE data model.	Might be worth to rephrase it. "Core Recommendation 4 and 7 and Good Practice 2 and 3 are the base for the purpose of a precise time tracking. However, to enable users to understand the changes in statistical units across time, it might be required to include, in the data management system, information about the evolutions. The Evolution part of the INSPIRE data model may be a good starting point but its effectiveness has to be tested and assessed."	OK first proposal (rephrased), NO second statement. The evolution part of INSPIRE, its contradictions and insufficient design is part of the problem, not a good starting for the solution.

44	IGN F	6.4	5th paragraph	T	"The second step is **to manage the differences of geometry** across time (adding areas with changes in common polygons or estimating the share parts for different units, or mixed procedures)." **The sentence is confusing: the second step is about finding relevant procedures to transfer statistical information, taking into account the differences of geometries across time.** **It is out of scope because not dealing directly with SU but with statistical information.**	To be rephrased.	OK. Changes included.
45	Eurostat	6.5		G	This section is not very clear. The justification of using SDMX and TJS in the last paragraph sounds weak. There is no obligation to mention SDMX and TJS.	The section could be clarified. The last paragraph could be removed.	NO accepted proposals. The comment not explain the unclear aspects. The mention about SDMX and TJS is introduced from the proposals of other statistical experts, despite is not mandatory to mention it.
46	IGN F	6.5	2nd paragraph	E	Acronym for Utility and governmental services is "US" and not "UG"	To be corrected.	OK. Sorry
47	Eurostat	6.5		E	Out of scope for this paper	Remove	NO. The differences and similitudes between Statistical Units in INSPIRE and Core Data are a key point of the difficulties of time tracking and no out of scope.
48	Eurostat	6.6.2		E	Shorten the part to a more concise representation	Shorten	??. Point 6.6.2 doesn't exist. Paragraph 6.2.2 is made with the proposals of many participants.
49	IGN F	7.1.1.2	NOTE 2	E	Too close from previous paragraph	Drop a line	OK
50	IGN F	Figure 4 and 7.1.1.2.1	End page 24	T	All vector statistical units will have to be provided at different levels of detail => it might be worth to upgrade INSPIRE identifier to core recommendation	Modify figure 4 Add a sentence (in 7.1.1.2.1) to remind that INSPIRE id should be provided.	??. I see the inspireid is highlighted. OK. Reminded added in the last paragraph of 7.1.1.2.1 (pag. 24)

51	DG REGIO	7.1.1.2	Figure 4	E	Update and correct the terminology in the model	Replace LAU1OrEquivalent and LAU2OrEquivalent by LAUOrEquivalent; remove largerUrbanZone (this is the obsolete synonym of funcationalUrbanArea; replcae urbanZone by greaterCity	OK.
52	DG REGIO	7.1.2.1	Figure 7	E	Update the terminology in the model	Replace LAU1 and LAU2 by LAU (single level)	OK
53	Eurostat	8		E	Out of scope for this paper	Add comment earlier on that PC are out of scope and should be in AD	NO. It's a methodological annex for inform the readers about the process of building the recommendation. It's a transparency measure.
54	IGNF	8	3rd paragraph	E	"Due to the specific subject and the background of WGA Members a consultation to geostatistical experts of National Statistical Institutes was **designed**"	Replace by "Due to the specific subject and the background of WGA Members a consultation to geostatistical experts of National Statistical Institutes was **decided**"	OK
55	IGNF	8	3rd paragraph	E	"NUTS, Urban Areas, Grid of 1Km side and smaller, Enumeration Districts and Postal Codes are surveyed in detail." The other sentences in the paragraph are using preterit.	Replace by "NUTS, Urban Areas, Grid of 1Km side and smaller, Enumeration Districts and Postal Codes **were** surveyed in detail"	OK. Sorry
56	IGNF	8	3rd paragraph	E	"**Tempo**, metadata and quality issues were also included"	Replace by "**Temporal aspects** , metadata and quality issues were also included	OK
57	IGN F	8		T	The questionnaire was a key step in WG A methodology but we have also used other sources to collect user requirements.	Mention that we have also collected user requirements from other sources (e.g. user presentations during EFGS or Luxembourg meetings and above all, the document about the European profile of GSGF): they have been useful input for our more advanced good practices or considerations for future.	OK. Thanks. It's a very good proposal. Added at the end of Annex 8
58	IGN F	9	2nd paragraph		"the goals established **should to** forget the contending theoretical approaches" The phrase is not correct. Do you mean "the goals established should **not** forget the contending theoretical approaches" ?	To be corrected	OK. Text improved, but not in the sense suggested by your comment because the original intention was the opposite.
59	Eurostat	9 Annex C		G	This section does not fit the document.	It could be removed.	NOT accepted. Some general framework is useful, even necessary.
60	Eurostat	9		E	Out of scope for this paper	remove	Same as the Id. 59 proposal and same answer.