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Outline

• General preconditions for use of administrative data for statistics
• Challenges for disaggregation – and how they can be resolved
• Building a system for statistics based on administrative sources
• A concrete example. Using linked data for indicator 16.7.1
General preconditions for producing register-based statistics

• Legal base
• Public approval
• Unified identification system
• Comprehensive and reliable register system
• Cooperation between authorities
Challenges for disaggregation

• Administrative registers may differ from statistical purposes by different concepts and definitions, classifications, timing, coverage

• …but if that is solved.. a challenge remains:

• The registers are designed for administrative purposes – and will likely only contain information relevant for the register owner.

• The NSOs are often not in a position to directly influence the contents of the registers.

• Linking and combining sources provides a solution.
The Nordic solution - 3 base registers

The Norwegian Tax Administration
(Central Population Register: Population)

The Brønnøysund Register Centre
(National Coordinating Register for Legal Entities: Businesses)

The Norwegian Mapping Authority
(Cadastre: Properties)

Daily transfer of transaction data to Statistics Norway
Linking of data on individuals in Statistics Norway

Same unique identifier used in all registers

+ many more (around 100 adm registers)
INDICATOR 16.7.1

• Proportions of positions in national and local institutions, including (a) the legislatures; (b) the public service; and (c) the judiciary, compared to national distributions, by sex, age, persons with disabilities and population groups
# Members of municipal councils by sex, age and immigrant background 2007-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Total population 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10 952</td>
<td>10 785</td>
<td>10 621</td>
<td>9 334</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>6 842</td>
<td>6 670</td>
<td>6 476</td>
<td>5 555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>4 110</td>
<td>4 115</td>
<td>4 145</td>
<td>3 779</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Share of women</strong></td>
<td>38 %</td>
<td>38 %</td>
<td>39 %</td>
<td>40 %</td>
<td>50 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29 years</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 years</td>
<td>2 041</td>
<td>1 810</td>
<td>1 661</td>
<td>1 524</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 years</td>
<td>3 194</td>
<td>3 134</td>
<td>3 008</td>
<td>2 529</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59 years</td>
<td>3 072</td>
<td>2 846</td>
<td>2 751</td>
<td>2 412</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 years or older</td>
<td>1 845</td>
<td>1 997</td>
<td>2 214</td>
<td>1 873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Share of 18-29 years</strong></td>
<td>7 %</td>
<td>9 %</td>
<td>9 %</td>
<td>11 %</td>
<td>16 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With immigrant background</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Share with immigrant background</strong></td>
<td>2 %</td>
<td>3 %</td>
<td>3 %</td>
<td>3 %</td>
<td>18 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To conclude

• Consistency in numbers. CPR as a basis for all linkages

• Statistics as a by-product – cost effective – reduces the response burden

• There is a huge potential for use of administrative data for SDGs – ensures disaggregation