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1 Introduction

SERISS Survey Experts Network

The ‘SERISS Survey Experts Network’ is a series of workshops thematically based around SERISS work packages. The aim of the workshops is to bring together survey practitioners and researchers (e.g. representatives from national statistics institutes, cross-national European surveys, survey agencies and survey methodologists) in order to facilitate a productive exchange of knowledge and practices in state-of-art survey research, to initiate a discussion on how to tackle specific challenges in survey methodology and data harmonisation, and to encourage future cooperation between different organisations.

A number of large organisations involved in cross-national survey research agreed to join the forum including: Eurostat, Eurofound, PIAAC (OECD), ISSP, European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA), Gallup World Poll, RTI, Kantar Public and Ipsos MORI. These organisations will be invited to send representatives to all workshops. Further, up to six other external participants (e.g. representatives from national statistics institutes, academics) with expertise in particular topics discussed during the workshops will be invited to each workshop.

There will be in total four annual workshops over the lifetime of the SERISS project. The first workshop was on sampling (see next section for details). The second workshop will be organised around the outputs of SERISS Work Package 8 ‘A coding module for socio-economic survey questions’ dealing with the tools available for coding socio-economic variables and will take place in autumn 2017. Topics for the other survey network workshops are still to be finalised but could include translation and web surveys.

First workshop on sampling

This report is a summary of the first workshop ‘Representing the population in surveys’ which draws on work done in SERISS Work Package 2 dealing with sampling approaches and challenges in cross-national surveys. The workshop took place on 8th December 2016 in Munich and was hosted by Munich Center for the Economics of Aging (MEA). The main purpose of the first workshop was to review sampling practices across Europe, to exploit synergies to be gained from exchanging knowledge and to discuss possible cooperation in gaining better access to registers or sharing sampling frames across surveys. Fourteen external sampling experts and 11 SERISS researchers attended the workshop (see Appendix 1 for the workshop agenda and Appendix 2 for the participants list). Diversity of participants representing various organisations (e.g. public cross-national survey infrastructures, commercial survey agencies, representatives of non-profit organisations conducting social surveys, universities, national statistics institutes) involved in survey research enabled a fruitful exchange of different perspectives on sampling-related challenges. To enable exchange between participants, the workshop had an interactive format with a longer discussion session initiated by six short presentations on different areas of sampling-related challenges. The report summarises the presentations given during the workshop, the discussion outcomes, and planned future steps.
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2 Review of sampling practices across Europe

Presentation by Annette Scherpenzeel, SERISS Work Package 2 leader, SHARE MEA

The goal of SERISS Work Package 2 ‘Representing the population’ is to explore, document and share best probability-based sampling practices that are essential for high quality surveys to draw inferences about general or specific populations. Probability-based sampling can be a complex and expensive process. Although population registers are available in 23 out of 30 European countries, according to an overview of population registers compiled by Poulain & Herm (2013), they are not always accessible for social surveys. Studies about the actual use of existing registers for sampling purposes are scarce and focus on a single country only. The SERISS review of sampling practices across Europe’ aimed at providing a comprehensive overview and comparison of applied sampling frames and available auxiliary variables in four large European cross-national face-to-face surveys involved in the SERISS project: European Social Survey (ESS), Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE), European Values Study (EVS), and Generation and Gender Programme (GGP).

Figure 1: Participation in the expert survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>ESS</th>
<th>EVS</th>
<th>GGP</th>
<th>SHARE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invited for expert survey (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed expert survey (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries (abbreviations)</td>
<td>AT, BE, CH, CZ, DE, EE, ES, FI, FR, GB, HU, IE, IL, IS, LT, NL, NO, PL, RU, SE, SL</td>
<td>BE, BG, CH, CY, CZ, DE, DK, EE, ES, FI, FR, GB, GE, GR, HR, HU, IE, IS, IT, LT, LU, ME, MK, MT, NL, PL, PT, RO, RS, RU, SE, SK, UA</td>
<td>AT, CZ, DE, EE, FR, HU, IT, NL, NO, SE</td>
<td>AT, BE, CH, DK, DE, EE, ES, ES-gi, FR, GR, HR, IL, IT, LU, NL, PL, PT, SE, SI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


A survey was conducted with the sampling experts in participating countries from these four surveys about their experience with obtaining sampling frames. The following information was collected: name and type of register used for the sampling purpose, responsible
authority, accessibility of the register for researchers and survey organisations, time needed to obtain the data, any difficulties in obtaining the register data, and available auxiliary variables provided in the register as well as other sources of auxiliary data that were used by the survey. Figure 1 illustrates countries that provided the requested information across the four participating surveys.

An overview table documenting the collected information was produced in excel and is available on the SERISS website. It can serve as a valuable information source for survey practitioners and researchers in need of a sampling frame in a particular country or a set of sampling frames across different countries. Figure 2 provides an excerpt from this table for illustrative purposes.

Figure 2: Excerpt from the sampling practices overview table

![Table Image]

Source: Scherpenzeel et al. 2016.

In addition to the excel documentation file, a report (Scherpenzeel et al. 2016) summarising the findings across countries and across surveys and comparing the use of sampling frames to the availability of population registers in European countries was produced and is published on the SERISS website. A second report (Bristle et al. 2016) on auxiliary data in available country registers is also available.

The results of the study show that despite the existence of central population registers in most countries, there are difficulties obtaining sampling frames from these registers in some European countries and alternative registers (e.g. health insurance registers, electoral registers) or alternative sampling techniques (e.g. geographic listing, random route sampling) are used in practice. In ten countries with available population register (Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Romania and Slovakia), this register was not used as a sampling frame by any of the participating surveys. Access to population registers is more problematic for commercial survey agencies than for universities. In ten further countries (Croatia, Georgia, United Kingdom, Ireland, Montenegro, Portugal, Republic of Macedonia, Russian Federation, Republic of Serbia, and Ukraine) there was no existing central or local population register and alternative registers or sampling techniques were applied to draw a sample.

Despite the access difficulties, the use of population registers remains the most common sampling frame, although the use of population registers for sampling purposes varies across countries and surveys. Figure 3 shows the use of population registers across...
countries. In ten countries all surveys (if their survey was fielded in that country) used the same register.

Figure 3: Use of population register across countries

- brown = popn register used in all four studies
- orange = popn register used in three of the four studies
- yellow = popn register used in two of the four studies
- light yellow = popn register used in one of the four studies
- white = no popn register used at all

Source: Scherpenzeel et al. 2016.

Discussion of possible cooperation in obtaining sample frames

It was suggested that different surveys using the same register in a particular country could benefit from jointly building and sharing sampling frames. In countries where some surveys use the population registers and others not, the surveys could benefit by sharing their experience and concerns with each other. Quality of register data (e.g. the data is not updated regularly, incorrect entries, coverage issues) might influence the decision on whether to use the register or not. The reasons for not using the registers where they exist are not systematically documented and collaboration between survey practitioners and researchers to produce such a documentation would be beneficial for various groups involved in sample design of cross-national social surveys.

In countries with an existing population register that is not used for social surveys, surveys could jointly build stakeholder groups lobbying for better access to these registers. Given that the access to population registers is more favourable for universities, survey organisations could cooperate with universities in obtaining sample frames. In countries with no available or accessible registers, surveys could cooperate to improve the quality of sampling using alternative methods. They could also explore the feasibility of building large common sampling frames using enumeration methods from which different surveys could draw their samples.
3 Sampling the institutional population
Presentation by Jan-Lucas Schanze, GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences

SERISS task 2.5 ‘Including the institutional population into a sample survey of the general population’ aims at providing guidelines for inclusion of the institutional population as part of the overall sampling design and recommendations on how coverage of the institutional population can be optimised.

The institutional population is a heterogeneous group including educational institutions, health care institutions, institutions for elderly persons, military institutions, penal facilities, refugee accommodation, monasteries, homeless shelters and other institutions. Most European surveys exclude the institutional population from their sample frames. Surveying the institutional population is associated with high costs of data collection. The main reasons for non-coverage are the following three characteristics of the institutional population:

- **Hard-to-sample** (small population, difficult access to specific registers)
- **Hard-to-contact** (direct contact is not always possible and first contact through gatekeepers is needed, e.g. operators of institutions or relatives)
- **Hard-to-interview** (e.g. language barriers, poor health conditions, functional and cognitive impairments)

The percentage of the population living in institutions varies across countries as well as across genders and age groups within the same country. Although generally the percentage of the institutional population in the entire population is relatively small, in specific age groups it can be above 5%. According to the Office for National Statistics (2015), about 5% of females and 5.6% of males aged between 16 and 24 in England and Wales were living in institutions in 2011. Among individuals aged 85 and above, the percentage was even higher with 15.2% for females and 7.8% for males. Excluding the institutional population would thus have an impact on the representativeness of a survey for specific age groups.

Exclusion of the institutional population could further result in selection bias as the institutional population is often distinct from the general population with regard to various demographic characteristics such as age and gender distribution, health status, economic status, housing, ethnicity, marital status as well as with regard to social networks.

The decision on whether to include the institutional population in a survey is primarily dependent on the subject and the target population of the survey. Data collection also depends on country-specific sampling frames available. Multiple sample frames might be needed if the institutional population is to be included in a survey.

The outputs of this SERISS task will be an inventory of European surveys including the institutional population and a feasibility report on sampling and surveying of the institutional population. The task is currently work-in-progress and the results will be made publicly available on the SERISS website at [www.seriss.eu/resources/deliverables](http://www.seriss.eu/resources/deliverables).
4 Obtaining sampling frames in practice

Presentation by Hayk Gyuzalyan, Kantar Public, Brussels

There are various challenges for commercial survey agencies in obtaining sampling frames. Survey agencies need to fulfil clients’ requirements in terms of specifications for selection probabilities of sampling units and provision of auxiliary variables. However, access to suitable frames, including individual population registers in some European countries, can be problematic for commercial organisations.

Depending on the country and sample frame owner, obtaining individual sample frames can be a challenging, time-consuming and costly task for commercial companies. Even in countries where population registers exist, they might not be accessible for survey agencies. Figure 4 illustrates the de facto availability of individual sampling frames for commercial survey agencies in European countries with existing population registers. In 12 out of 21 listed countries access is restricted or not possible for commercial organisations.

Figure 4: Practical availability of individual sampling frames for commercial survey agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Available in practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the limited access to individual sampling frames, from the point of view of a commercial survey agency it is more practical to use an address sample frame in most countries. However, control measures are more complicated in address samples where the selection of the person to be interviewed is left to the interviewers. Contact information beyond the address is rarely available. On the other hand, address samples are usually updated more regularly as compared to individual registers which is a problem, especially in countries with high migration. The quality of individual registers can be so low that they are used as an address register in practice. Another point to bear in mind when using individual registers is the time needed to gain the access. Early planning is necessary as the process can take up to two years in some countries. Especially in cross-national surveys this can be a problem as it can make it difficult to harmonise the start of fieldwork across all participating countries.

Commercial agencies could benefit from closer cooperation with survey researchers trying to influence decision makers to provide better access to population registers. Social surveys and survey agencies could also collaborate in defining guidelines for acceptable quality of registers and developing alternative strategies for probability-based sampling where access to registers is restricted or the quality is low.

5 Errors in random route samples and alternative techniques

Presentation by Johannes Bauer, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

Random routes samples are usually applied when population registers are not available or accessible, or the quality of the register data is not sufficient. They are based on an assumption that every household has the same probability of being selected for the sample. A study by Bauer (2014) demonstrates, however, that the commonly applied random route instructions prescribing whether the interviewers need to turn left or right or walk straight at crossroads can create overrepresentation of certain pathways and lead to strong bias in the selection of households along these pathways. Creation of systematic pathways results from walking instructions favouring specific streets. Also, selected starting locations are usually not equally distributed across the municipality.

True Random Route (TRR)

To achieve household selection with equal probability, walking instructions should be more flexible and avoid predefined routes that create systematic pathways. This could be done by randomising the next direction of the route at each crossroads. However, leaving randomisation to the interviewers complicates the ability of the survey agencies to recreate the route and check that the route was followed correctly. A possible solution would be providing interviewers with a randomly generated matrix for each route they need to follow. Another option would be to draw a generated route on a map with randomised direction at each crossroad. This approach is associated with additional resources needed for the preparation of the maps. Its advantage is, however, that a route drawn on a map might be easier to follow for the interviewers, the route would be less prone to errors and it would be easier for survey agencies to monitor the routes.

Randomising direction instructions would reduce selection bias caused by systematic pathways in routes with predefined direction instructions. However, this method cannot solve the problem of unequal distribution of starting locations with unknown selection probabilities.
**J-Section Sampling (JSS)**

The J-Section Sampling approach tackles the problem of unequal distribution of starting locations by allowing samples with known selection probabilities to be drawn. It is based on the use of accurate, up-to-date, available road map data. Every household can be linked to a street section, whereby a street section is defined as the area of a street between two junctions. All street sections are enumerated on the map (Figure 5). Then street sections and start junctions are randomly selected by the survey organisation. Interviewers start their walk at a predefined junction and street side. The first contacted household needs to be a random household from 1<sup>st</sup> to n<sup>th</sup> to ensure that all households in a street section have the same selection probability. From there every n<sup>th</sup> household can be contacted.

**Figure 5: J-Section Sampling**

![J-Section Sampling Diagram](image)


**Testing of alternative approaches**

Both suggested approaches have been tested in a simulation based on registration office data and road map data for the German town of Büttgen. Some of the results are presented in Figure 6 and compared to three random route techniques with predefined direction instructions as applied by different survey agencies. Both JSS and TRR approaches generally perform better than the other three random route samples in terms of being closer to the population mean and showing lower unequal distribution of selection probabilities.

The JSS approach is a possible solution for unequal distribution of starting locations. However, it is associated with additional resources for coding. Further, there can be street sections with no households that should ideally be identified before the interviewers start fieldwork. It might, therefore, be more practical for survey agencies that already use random route sampling to apply the TRR approach as it follows the basic principles of general random route and only requires changing direction instructions to reduce bias in household selection. Using longer interviewer routes could further reduce the effect of unequal distribution of starting locations in the TRR samples.
As the suggested approaches were tested in a simulation, further testing in a real survey situation would be needed to explore the feasibility of their practical implementation by survey agencies.

Figure 6: Simulation testing of True Random Route (TRR) and J-Section Sampling (JSS) approaches

Further variables: sex, citizenship, period of residence, duration of marriage, distance to the next supermarket, distance to the next playground

6 Sampling with no registers in practice: Example of a technique developed for Albania in the European Social Survey

Presentation by Alban Nelaj, EUNACAL Institute

As there is no available centralised population or address register in Albania and previous experience of the survey agency with random route sampling has revealed some selection bias, an alternative spiral sampling technique was developed for Albania in the European Social Survey Round 6 (2012). In the previously applied random route samples official buildings (e.g. schools) were chosen as starting points and areas further away from these buildings were not well represented.

Spiral sampling technique

The List of Albanian Voting Buildings was used to draw primary sampling units (PSU) after stratification. 267 PSUs were randomly selected in the first stage by applying a specifically developed R command. In the second stage, simple random sampling of six dwellings in each PSU was applied whereby the selection of the dwellings was performed by using a voting building’s location on a Google Map as the centre and then using the spiral technique.
to select dwellings within the PSU. A spiral with six tick marks was overlapped with the Google Map and the dwellings closest to the tick marks were selected (Figure 7). Voting buildings proved to be a good starting point because they are chosen in such a way that the distance to all buildings in a particular voting area is similar and they have better distribution in the municipality than other official buildings. If the dwelling contained more than one household, the household to be interviewed was randomly selected by using a random number generator on a tablet device. Respondents to be interviewed were randomly selected using the last birthday method.

Figure 7: Illustration of the spiral sampling technique


This technique allowed selection of dwellings by technology rather than by the interviewers as is done in the traditional random route approaches. Further advantages of this technique were better coverage and better sample quality. Geographical coordinates of selected dwellings were sent to interviewers’ GPS-enabled tablet devices to help interviewers to find the buildings. At the same time GPS monitoring, which is allowed in Albania during working hours, enabled better control by the survey agency of interviewer behaviour in the field. However, implementation of the spiral techniques was associated with much higher costs and much longer fieldwork period compared with random routes samples.

7 Efficient sampling in social research

Presentation by Volker Bosch, GfK Germany

Social surveys aim to achieve representativeness given the resources at hand (e.g. time, money, technical infrastructure). Representativeness is achieved when the bias of the sample’s variable is considerably smaller than the standard error. It is, thus, a feature of a sample’s variable, not of a sample as a whole. Precision, on the other hand, is a function of sample size and is included when the standard error of the sample’s estimate is small. Mean Square Error (MSE) – the sum of squared bias and standard error – describes how close an estimate is to the true parameter. MSE is an important key performance indicator of sample
quality. An efficient sample minimises MSE subject to the resources at hand. When social researchers plan a survey, priority should be given to sampling approaches that would minimise MSE given the resources at hand.

Register based samples (RBS) and random route samples (RRS) enable control of sampling probabilities and the bias introduced through sampling are very small compared with other sampling techniques. Both techniques are, however, time-consuming and expensive. Registers are also not easily accessible for survey organisations. Although there is no interviewer bias involved in respondent selection in both techniques (if interviewers follow instructions correctly), there is still a problem of non-response that is not mitigated with RBS and RRS. Another problem that can occur is low quality of register data (e.g. irregular updates, omissions, double counts, errors, nominal members) in RBS or data bases used for RRS (sample points and their populations are often not up-to-date and statistical estimates are used).

Although probability-based sampling methods such as RBS and RRS are the most effective (especially for survey with large sample sizes), they are not always affordable. If sufficient resources are not available, non-probability face-to-face quota samples and CATI sampling can be used as alternative methods for small and mid-sized samples, enabling fast data collection and larger sample sizes for the same money. The bias of non-random selection in face-to-face quota samples can be mitigated if only a small number of interviews is conducted by the same interviewer, with quotas that are neither too easy not too hard to achieve. Statistical monitoring should be used to prevent interviewer misconduct. CATI random samples require a high penetration of either mobile or landline telephones (or a high combined reach) and a high quality RDD sample frame. Dual Frame approaches are favorable. The samples must be professionally weighted.

Professionally implemented face-to-face quota sampling and CATI sampling can achieve similar MSE as RBS and RSS for the less money if sample size is less than 10,000. In general, however, bias is hard to estimate as it varies across variables, and testing is necessary to obtain valid indication as to which sampling method is preferable.

8 Discussion session

Chaired by Ineke Stoop, The Netherlands Institute for Social Research (SCP) and chair of the European Statistical Advisory Committee

The question for discussion was: How can we achieve better representativeness of the population? Participants were asked to write down the main sampling-related challenges they are faced with in their work. Amongst commonly mentioned issues were:

- Access to registers
- Quality of register-based sampling frames
- Using multiple registers/data sources
- Communicating sampling requirements
- Alternatives to registers
- Weighting
- Harmonisation across countries
- Inclusion of migrant population
Issues were grouped into three main themes for discussion, with participants forming three break out groups, one to discuss each theme.

- Access to registers
- Quality of registers
- Drawing samples where no satisfactory sample frames exist

Participants were asked to share their experiences within their group, to discuss how specific challenges could be tackled and how the group could collaborate in future to contribute towards improvements.

The first interest group ‘Access to registers’ noted that there are often legal constraints or lack of interest in cooperation from register owners’ point of view making the access to population registers difficult. There should be more joint effort to influence policy makers to change legislation to make access less problematic for social surveys. Social surveys could share information about their experience of dealing with legal restrictions. The relevance of social surveys should be also better communicated to national statistics institutes who mainly see social surveys as a ‘secondary’ product. The greater efficiency and lower costs of register-based sampling (relative to other methods such as random route) should also be communicated, as well as the fact that surveys are often funded by public money.

Internally, the group could benefit from sharing information and materials related to sampling. This could include developing a standard template for survey technical reports or the documentation of procedures involved in obtaining a sample frame. Sharing practical experiences including, for example, contact details of stakeholders who were instrumental in gaining access to sample registers, would also be valuable. One participant in this group volunteered to coordinate future activities of the group. The next action for the group could be to investigate and document why population registers are not used in certain countries even though they exist there.

The second interest group ‘Quality of registers’ discussed the main quality issues associated with population registers such as incorrect entries, coverage, the timing of updates, and omissions. There is a need for objective measurements to assess the quality of registers and guidelines on when the quality of a register may not be sufficient for it to be used as a sampling frame. In cases of low quality, the feasibility of alternative methods, including the possible use of dual frames, should be explored. Country-level consortiums could be formed to assess the quality of population registers in their countries. This information could be shared internationally through reports and at conferences. Group participants were interested in future collaboration to set up a list of quality indicators for register data.

The third interest group ‘Drawing samples where no satisfactory sample frames exist’ discussed alternative cost-efficient sampling methods. Geodata and alternative listings (e.g. listing of dwellings) can be used to draw probability-based samples. If non-probability sampling is applied, it needs to be model-based. Easily accessible geodata offers new possibilities for development of new sampling methods but these new methods need to be tested. In general, there is a demand for experimentation with and testing of alternative sampling approaches in real surveys but funding is not easily available. Academic researchers and commercial survey agencies could collaborate to test new methods. Participants in this interest group expressed interest in future collaboration for experimentation and testing of alternative sampling approaches.
9 Next steps

Due to the diversity of participants representing different organisations involved in survey methodology (academic researchers, cross-national survey infrastructures, commercial survey agencies, Eurostat, international non-profit organisations conducting own surveys), the SERISS Survey Expert Network workshop on ‘representing the population’ enabled a fruitful exchange of different perspectives on sampling-related challenges. It also served as a platform to form groups for future collaboration.

Participants mentioned that closer collaboration between national statistics institutes and survey researchers on sampling-related issues would be welcome. Representatives from Statistics Netherlands and Eurostat participating in the workshop volunteered to bring the issue of problematic access to registers to the attention of their institutions and to emphasise the importance of social surveys and cooperation with them. In a further attempt to reach this specific stakeholder group, representatives from the SERISS project will attend the Eurostat conference New Techniques and Technologies for Statistics (NTTS) in March 2017.

To enable future communication and information exchange between the participants, a digital network has been set up on Basecamp. This platform will be used to share information and materials and to organise possible follow-up meetings. There are no further resources within the SERISS project for follow-up meetings. However, follow-up meetings could be organised on the back of conferences attended by workshop participants. The possibility of organising the first follow-up meeting at the International Workshop on Comparative Survey Design and Implementation (CSDI) in March 2017 is being investigated. A second possibility would be to organise something alongside the European Survey Research Association (ESRA) conference in July 2017. Concrete action points and tasks division for each interest groups should be discussed and shared on Basecamp.
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# Appendix 1: Workshop agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00-10:15</td>
<td>Welcome and introduction of participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10:15-10:30   | Introduction to SERISS
Rory Fitzgerald, SERISS Coordinator & ESS ERIC Director |
| 10:30-11:30   | Improving survey sampling frames across Europe: accessibility and use of national registers
- 10:30-11:00 Use of sampling frames in European surveys
  Annette Scherpenzeel, SERISS WP2 Leader, SHARE MEA
- 11:00-11:30 Obtaining samples in practice: Experiences and challenges
  Hayk Gyuzalyan, TNS opinion |
| 11:30-11:45   | COFFEE BREAK                                                            |
| 11:45-13:00   | Sampling with no available registers: techniques and sample quality
- 11:45-12:15 Errors in random route samples
  Johannes Bauer, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München
- 12:15-12:35 Sampling with no registers in practice: Example of a spiral technique developed for Albania in the European Social Survey
  Alban Nelaj, EUNACAL Institute
- 12:35-13:00 Efficient sampling in social research
  Volker Bosch, GfK Germany |
| 13:00-13:45   | LUNCH                                                                   |
| 13:45-15:30   | Improving survey sampling: Discussion and exchange of ideas
Chair: Ineke Stoop, SCP, Chair of European Statistical Advisory Committee (ESAC) |
| 15:30-15:45   | COFFEE BREAK                                                            |
| 15:45-16:15   | Discussion of future cooperation in sampling practices                  |
| 16:15-16:30   | Next meeting and AOB                                                    |
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