The Business Environment and Enterprise Performance Survey (BEEPS) V

A Report on methodology and observations
October 2015

Table of Contents

1   Background

The Business Environment Survey (BEEPS) is a joint initiative of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) and the World Bank Group (the World Bank). The survey was first undertaken on behalf of the EBRD and World Bank in 1999 – 2000, when it was administered to approximately 4,100 enterprises in 25 countries of Eastern Europe and Central Asia (including Turkey) to assess the environment for private enterprise and business development.

In the second round of BEEPS in 2002, the survey instrument was administered to almost 6,700 enterprises in 27 countries. In the third round of BEEPS, the survey included approximately 9,900 enterprises in 27 countries in 2005. In seven of the countries the survey included an additional sampling overlay of the manufacturing sector in addition to the main BEEPS sample. Furthermore, to set a benchmark for the transition countries, a survey of comparator countries was conducted in 2004-2005 in two rounds (Germany, Greece, Portugal, South Korea and Vietnam were covered in 2004 and Ireland and Spain in 2005).

In the fourth round of BEEPS in 2008-2009, the survey covered almost 12,000 enterprises in 29 countries (including Mongolia for the first time). The survey was restructured to improve cross-country comparability and to make it compatible with the Enterprise Surveys the Enterprise Analysis Unit of the World Bank has been implementing in other regions of the world since 2006. There were changes in the questionnaire and methodology.

The fifth round of BEEPS (BEEPS V) in 2011-2013 covered approximately 15,600 enterprises in 30 countries, including 4,220 enterprises in 37 regions in Russia. It included an Innovation Module, covering product, process, organisational and marketing innovation, as well as management practices in manufacturing enterprises with at least 20 employees (50 employees in Russia). BEEPS V Russia was implemented in 2011-2012, and is described in a separate report.

The objective of the survey is to obtain feedback from enterprises in EBRD countries of operation on their perception of the environment in which they operate as well as to help in building a panel of enterprise data that will make it possible to track changes in the business environment over time.

Through interviews with firms in the manufacturing and services sectors, BEEPS captures business perceptions of the biggest obstacles to enterprise growth, the relative importance of various constraints to increasing employment and productivity, and the effects of a country's business environment on its international competitiveness. BEEPS is used to create statistically significant business environment indicators that are comparable across countries.

The report outlines and describes the sampling design of the data, the data set structure as well as additional information that may be useful when using the data, such as information on non-response cases and the appropriate use of weights.

The fifth round of BEEPS was implemented by Ipsos MORI in cooperation with local partners. For details, refer to Annex A.

BEEPS V has been supported by the EBRD Shareholder Special Fund.

2 BEEPS Methodology

2.1 Survey universe, sample population and sampling frames

The whole population, or universe of the study, are commercial, service or industrial business establishments with at least 5 full-time employees in the non-agricultural economy. It comprises: all manufacturing sectors according to the group classification of ISIC Revision 3.1: (group D), construction sector (group F), services sector (groups G and H), and transport, storage, and communications sector (group I). Note that this definition excludes the following sectors: financial intermediation (group J), real estate and renting activities (group K, except sub-sector 72, IT, which was added to the population under study), and all public or utilities-sectors. Government departments including military, police, education, health and similar activities were excluded, as were those in primary industries including agriculture, mining, etc. There are no up to date and reliable statistics relating to this universe in the countries being surveyed in BEEPS V. Consequently the universe size and characteristics have to be directly estimated from the survey results themselves. This requirement increases the emphasis that has to be placed on the quality of the sample frame, because the validity of the results is predominantly a function of coverage and age of the sampling frame.

The criteria used to evaluate the available sampling frame in descending priority were those of:
- Coverage
- Up to datedness
- Availability of detailed stratification variables
- Location identifiers- address, phone number, email
- Electronic format availability
- Contact name(s)

The sampling frames used for the surveys must consist of the lists of enterprises in each country that most optimally meet these requirements. The final selection was made by Ipsos MORI in collaboration with the EBRD and the World Bank. For all countries covered in BEEPS V two sampling frames were used. The first sampling frame was often an official frame of establishments supplied by the national statistical office of the country and the second sampling frame consisted of establishments that participated in BEEPS IV. In Albania, a suitable sampling frame did not exists, so the the design returned to first principles, using a blocks enumeration methodology.

2.2 Specifications of the survey

2.2.1 Coverage of countries:

Fifth round of BEEPS was implemented in 30 countries (Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Georgia, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Kosovo, Kyrgyz Republic, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, Poland, Romania, Russia, Serbia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Tajikistan, Turkey, Ukraine and Uzbekistan). It was not possible to implement BEEPS V in Turkmenistan.

2.2.2 Sampling structure

In all countries where a reliable sampling frame was available (except Albania), the sample was selected using stratified random sampling, following the methodology explained in the Sampling Manual. Stratified random sampling was preferred over simple random sampling for several reasons:
- To obtain unbiased estimates for different subdivisions of the population with some known level of precision.
- To obtain unbiased estimates for the whole population. The whole population, or the universe of the study, is the non-agricultural economy. It comprises all manufacturing sectors according to the group

classification of ISIC Revision 3.1 (group D), construction sector (group F), services sector (groups G and H), and transport, storage and communications sector (group I). Note that this definition excludes the following sectors: financial intermediation (group J), real estate and renting activities (group K, except sub sector 72, IT, which was added to the population under study), and all public or utilities sectors.

- To make sure that the final total sample includes establishments from all different sectors and that it is not concentrated in one or two of industries/sizes/regions.
- To exploit the benefits of stratified sampling where population estimates, in most cases, will be more precise than using a simple random sampling method (i.e., lower standard errors, all things being equal).
- Stratification may produce a smaller bound on the error of estimation than would be produced by a simple random sample of the same size. This result is particularly true if measurements within strata are homogeneous.
- The cost per observation in the survey may be reduced by stratification of the population elements into convenient groupings.

Due to a lack of reliable sampling frame blocks enumeration was used in Albania. Detailed description can be found under country-specific information.

Three levels of stratification were used in all countries: industry, establishment size and region. The original sample designs with specific information of the industries and regions chosen are described in country-specific pages in Annex A.

In all countries, the sample was stratified along Manufacturing, Retail trade (sector 52) and Other services. In some of the countries, there were specific target numbers of interviews for more detailed sectors within these three groups.

Size stratification was defined following the standardized definition for the rollout: small (5-19 employees), medium (20-99 employees), and large (more than 99 employees).[1] For stratification purposes, the number of employees was defined on the basis of reported permanent full-time workers. This seems to be an appropriate definition of the labour force, since seasonal/casual/part-time employment is not a common practice, except in the sectors of construction and agriculture.

Details on the regional stratification can be found in country-specific information in Annex A.

Along the defined stratification guidelines, priority was given to completing interviews with establishments who participated in BEEPS IV.

2.3 Sampling implementation

Given the stratified design, sampling frames containing a complete and updated list of establishments as well as information on all stratification variables (number of employees, industry, and region) are required to draw the sample. Great efforts were made to obtain the best source for these listings. However, the quality of sampling frames was not optimal and, therefore, some adjustments were needed to correct for the presence of ineligible units. These adjustments are reflected in the weights computation.

For most countries covered in BEEPS V two sampling frames were used. The first sampling frame was obtained from the official sources in the countries (details for each country can be found in country-specific information). The second sampling frame, supplied by the EBRD and the World Bank, consisted of enterprises interviewed in BEEPS IV. Ipsos MORI was required to attempt to re-interview

---

[1] The panel firms from BEEPS with less than 5 employees are included in the 5 to 19 strata.

establishments responding to the BEEPS IV survey where they were within the selected geographical region and met eligibility criteria. That sample is referred to as the Panel.

The quality of the sampling frames was assessed at the onset of the project through calls. The sampling frames proved to be useful, though they all showed positive rates of non-eligibility, repetition, non-existent units, etc. These problems are typical of establishment surveys, but given the impact these inaccuracies may have on the results, adjustments were needed when computing the appropriate weights for individual observations.

Table 1 depicts the targeted Number of completed interviews for BEEPS IV, along with achieved total Number of completed interviews and Number of completed interviews with panel establishments.

Table 1: Targeted and achieved Number of completed interviews

Country	Number of completed interviews							Completed in 2008	
	Target	*Completed*	*Panel*	*Manufacturing*	*Retail*	*Core*	*Innovation*	*Completed*	*Panel*
Albania	360	360	120	111	129	120	92	175	17
Armenia	360	360	168	111	121	128	134	374	99
Azerbaijan	360	390	69	122	116	152	91	380	106
Belarus	360	360	121	117	124	119	254	273	71
Bosnia and Herzegovina	360	360	115	117	114	129	213	361	63
Bulgaria	270	293	70	102	85	106	173	288	118
Croatia	360	360	37	119	119	122	240	159	50
Czech Republic	270	254	18	107	53	94	184	250	17
Estonia	270	273	73	87	99	87	111	273	66
FYR Macedonia	360	360	179	119	109	132	211	366	87
Georgia	360	360	81	113	131	116	91	373	68
Hungary	270	310	63	99	108	103	132	291	62
Kazakhstan	540	600	83	200	200	200	256	544	77
Kosovo	270	202	11	74	33	95	158	270	na
Kyrgyz Republic	270	270	44[†]	104	46	120	179	235	71
Latvia	270	336	92	118	112	106	141	271	57
Lithuania	270	270	45	105	81	84	126	276	45
Moldova	360	360	183	109	134	117	170	363	128
Mongolia	360	360	131	120	120	120	211	362	na
Montenegro	150	150	54	48	51	51	50	116	5
Poland	540	542	17	184	176	182	327	533	79
Romania	540	540	97	177	178	185	401	541	92
Russia	4200	4220	128	1321	467	2432	2025	1256	57
Serbia	360	360	120	113	119	128	211	388	112
Slovak Republic	270	268*	12	99	86	83	122	275	33
Slovenia	270	270	95	85	91	94	162	276	57
Tajikistan	360	359	35	123	120	116	162	360	67
Turkey	1320	1344**	137	1096	122	126	858	1152	425[†]
Ukraine	1000	1002	192	737	134	131	528	851	120
Uzbekistan	360	390	140	130	132	128	100	366	112
TOTAL	**15670**	**15883**	**2730**	**6267**	**3710**	**5906**	**8113**	**11998**	**2361**

* In Slovak Republic, 276 interviews were completed; 8 of them were dropped because of poor data quality.

** In Turkey, 1363 interviews were completed; 19 of them were dropped because the observations were selected non-randomly in the previous round.

[†] In Kyrgyz Republic, one interview was wrongly assigned panel status in the previous version of the report.

3 Fieldwork

3.1 Questionnaires and translation

Three main questionnaires were used for the survey – core, services and manufacturing – depending on the respondent's industry. In addition, two innovation modules were used – core/retail and manufacturing. A screener questionnaire was also used during the recruitment phase.

In Ukraine and Turkey, there was a Coin Toss Module, designed to provide an indication of the extent to which respondents provided candid answers. The responses to the coin toss can be analysed in order to identify the extent to which reticent respondents answer differently to sensitive questions in the survey, and to adjust for these reticence effects when drawing conclusions from the survey. In addition, in Turkey, there was a Gender Module.

The questionnaires were translated into local languages (Table 2).

Table 2: Questionnaire languages used in each country

Country	Languages
Albania	Albanian
Armenia	Armenian
Azerbaijan	Azerbaijani
Belarus	Belarusian
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Bosnian
Bulgaria	Bulgarian
Croatia	Croatian
Czech Republic	Czech
Estonia	Estonia, Russian
FYR Macedonia	Macedonian
Georgia	Georgian
Hungary	Hungarian
Kazakhstan	Kazakh, Russian
Kosovo	Kosovan
Kyrgyz Republic	Kyrgyz, Russian
Latvia	Latvian, Russian
Lithuania	Lithuanian
Moldova	Moldovan
Mongolia	Mongolian
Montenegro	Montenegrin
Poland	Polish
Romania	Romanian
Serbia	Serbian
Slovak Republic	Slovak
Slovenia	Slovenian
Tajikistan	Tajik, Russian
Turkey	Turkish
Ukraine	Ukrainian, Russian
Uzbekistan	Uzbek, Russian

The translation process progressed as follows:
1. When the questionnaire and showcards were finalised, they were sent to the national agencies for translation.
2. The questionnaire was translated by a suitably qualified and experienced executive within each local agency into the national offical languages.
3. The questionnaire was back translated into English by independent linguists from Language Connect, an independent translation agency.
4. The back translations were compared to the master English questionnaire by the Ipsos MORI team and a list of differences was sent to the local agency.
5. The local agencies amended the questionnaires.
6. The Ipsos MORI team checked the changes had been made.
7. After the pilot, further changes were made to the questionnaire by the local agencies
8. The national agencies sent the final national questionnaires and showcards to Ipsos MORI, and they were proof read by Language Connect.
9. The questionnaires and showcards were sent to the EBRD and WB for their approval.
10. The EBRD and WB provided final comments on the translations before the translations were finalised by the local agencies
11. Final national questionnaires were sent to the EBRD and WB for their records.

In addition, Country Profiles were also translated by the local agencies and proof-read by the translation agency. The Country Profiles were used during or after fieldwork, as an incentive for the interviewees.

3.2   CAPI scripting and testing

Once the translations had been approved, the countries using a CAPI script worked on setting up the script and then the script was thoroughly tested by each country manager. To test the script, the country manager checked the question wording and the routing was correct and made sure that logic checks had been built into the script where appropriate.

The Ipsos team also checked the final scripts, providing this was possible due to differences in software. If it was not possible to check the script, Ipsos requested a dummy topline, which means it is possible to check the routing is working and that single and multicode questions are set up correctly.

3.3   Mode of completion

The survey was carried out face to face in home. Questionnaires were administered either using Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) or Pen and Paper Interviewing (PAPI), depending on local practice in each country (see Table 3).

Table 3: Survey administration in each country

Country	Survey administration
Albania	PAPI
Armenia	PAPI
Azerbaijan	PAPI
Belarus	PAPI
Bosnia and Herzegovina	PAPI
Bulgaria	PAPI
Croatia	CAPI
Czech Republic	CAPI
Estonia	PAPI
FYR Macedonia	CAPI
Georgia	PAPI
Hungary	CAPI

Country	Survey administration
Kazakhstan	PAPI
Kosovo	PAPI
Kyrgyz Republic	PAPI
Latvia	PAPI
Lithuania	PAPI
Moldova	PAPI
Mongolia	PAPI
Montenegro	CAPI
Poland	CAPI
Romania	PAPI
Serbia	CAPI
Slovak Republic	CAPI/PAPI
Slovenia	CAPI
Tajikistan	PAPI
Turkey	CAPI/ PAPI
Ukraine	PAPI
Uzbekistan	PAPI

3.4 Training

Given the time restrictions and the number of countries included in the BEEPs V survey, centralised training briefings were organised with the country managers of all the local agencies.

Each country manager was required to attend a 3 day 'train the trainers' briefing to ensure that they were suitably well informed to train their agency field force and to manage the project. Two central briefings took place in Istanbul, one in Belgrade, one in Prague, and one in Tbilisi. Each training session lasted three days, and was delivered by representatives from the EBRD and WB teams, and Ipsos MORI. The training covered:
- BEEPS V management team introduction;
- Introduction of the BEEPS Survey by the World Bank/EBRD representative, on behalf of the World Bank and the EBRD;
- Universe and sample for BEEPS V
- Sampling frames and selected samples:
    - o Listings and quality control
    - o Sample management and fieldwork progress report
    - o Response rate: Follow up – methods to ensure a good response rate
- The questionnaires implementation:
    - o Key concepts
    - o Questionnaire manual
    - o Mock interviewing with the manufacturing questionnaire
    - o Innovation module and eligibility
    - o Multiple choice test
    - o Questionnaire proofreading
- Supervisors and interviewer training
- BEEPS V pilot survey
- Data entry and quality control
- An open question and answer session.

The briefings took place in the following locations in the periods indicated in Table 4.

Table 4: Location and dates of the briefings

Location	Countries	Language of the briefing	Dates
Istanbul	Turkey (manager, supervisors and interviewers)	Turkish	8-10 July 2012
Istanbul	Tajikistan	Russian	10-12 July 2012
	Uzbekistan		
	Azerbaijan		
	Kazakhstan		
	Mongolia		
	Krygyzstan		
Tbilisi	Armenia	Russian	22-24 July
	Georgia		
	Ukraine		
Prague	Czech Republic	English	15-17 July 2012
	Estonia		
	Hungary		
	Latvia		
	Lithuania		
	Moldova		
	Poland		
	Romania		
Belgrade	Albania	English	15-17 July 2012
	Belarus		
	Bosnia and Herzegovina		
	Bulgaria		
	Croatia		
	FYR Macedonia		
	Kosovo		
	Montenegro		
	Serbia		
	Slovenia		

This training ensured that project managers were well-prepared to train their own field force. Importantly, it also ensured that the content of the training in each country was the same.

For the supervisors and interviewer training, Ipsos MORI provided the training materials to the survey and fieldwork managers, covering the different training components such as:

- Written training. Each supervisor and interviewer received a questionnaire manual that had to be read carefully before the training. In addition, supervisors and interviewers received detailed interviewer instructions, in order to fully understand the survey methodology and objectives.
- Theoretical training. Once the supervisors and interviewers had reviewed the questionnaire manual and interviewer instructions, the survey manager in each country thoroughly explained the study's metholodology and reviewed the whole instrument, question by question, to ensure its correct comprehension, explain key concepts, unification of criteria, and answer any questions.
- Comprehension test. After the training, supervisors and interviewers completed a multiple choice test to assess their understanding of the survey methodology and questionnaire.

Additional interviewer briefings –over the phone or in person – were also organised whenever needed and according to any particular requirements of the survey.

For further details on the training on a country by country basis, please refer to the appendices.

3.5 Piloting

Before the survey was launched, a pilot was conducted in all countries included in BEEPS V. Interviews were conducted by local interviewers who provided feedback to their country managers. Table 5 shows the quotas achieved for the pilot interviews.

Table 5: Pilot fieldwork dates and interviews achieved

| Country | Pilot fieldwork dates | | Questionnaire type | | | | |
	Start	Finish	Manufacturing	Retail	Core	Innovation	Total
Albania	01/08/2012	10/08/2012	4	4	5	7	**13**
Armenia	08/08/2012	31/08/2012	5	4	3	3	**12**
Azerbaijan	25/08/2012	06/09/2012	5	5	5	5	**15**
Belarus	20/08/2012	28/08/2012	5	4	5	14	**14**
Bosnia and Herzegovina	15/08/2012	27/08/2012	4	2	3	4	**9**
Bulgaria	08/08/2012	17/08/2012	4	4	3	12	**11**
Croatia	24/08/2012	30/08/2012	4	3	5	6	**12**
Czech Republic	30/08/2012	31/08/2012	5	6	4	5	**15**
Estonia	30/08/2012	07/09/2012	6	2	7	4	**15**
FYR Macedonia	06/08/2012	20/08/2012	5	5	6	7	**16**
Georgia	25/08/2012	30/08/2012	1	2	4	3	**7**
Hungary	21/02/2013	22/02/2013	4	5	6	4	**15**
Kazakhstan	18/08/2012	28/08/2012	4	3	4	11	**11**
Kosovo	07/08/2012	17/08/2012	4	4	4	8	**12**
Kyrgyz Republic	25/07/2012	05/08/2012	5	5	3	8	**13**
Latvia	15/08/2012	31/08/2012	4	3	5	6	**12**
Lithuania	20/08/2012	29/08/2012	5	5	6	7	**16**
Moldova	20/08/2012	10/09/2012	3	4	5	6	**12**
Mongolia	29/07/2012	08/08/2012	6	4	5	9	**15**
Montenegro	11/08/2012	18/08/2012	4	4	4	4	**12**
Poland	13/08/2012	21/08/2012	9	2	2	7	**13**
Romania	13/08/2012	21/08/2012	4	2	10	9	**16**
Serbia	12/08/2012	19/08/2012	5	4	4	6	**13**
Slovak Republic	30/08/2012	31/08/2012	3	3	9	10	**15**
Slovenia	14/08/2012	23/08/2012	7	2	5	6	**14**
Tajikistan	16/09/2012	05/09/2012	5	4	6	13	**15**
Turkey	20/08/2012	24/08/2012	5	8	2	11	**15**
Ukraine	15/08/2012	22/08/2012	4	4	4	12	**12**
Uzbekistan	07/09/2012	13/09/2012	5	5	5	3	**15**

The main purpose of the pilot was to check that the translation was correct, the routing was correct, and that the questions were appropriate for the local environment. Also, these interviews were timed to ascertain the length of the questionnaire. All five questionnaires – core, manufacturing and services, and core/service and manufacturing innovation – were tested.

After the pilot was completed, a pilot report was sent to the World Bank and EBRD outlining the key findings and recommended changes to the questionnaire. A conference call was organised between the EBRD and the World Bank and Ipsos MORI to check the pilot results and agree on the final questionnaires to be used for fieldwork.

Any modification to the questionnaire and instructions were approved by the World Bank and EBRD task managers before the survey was implemented. Prior to the launch of the main survey, the World Bank and EBRD task managers gave their explicit approval of the survey instrument.

4   Survey and item non-response

Survey non-response must be differentiated from item non-response. The former refers to refusals to participate in the survey altogether whereas the latter refers to the refusals to answer some specific questions. BEEPS suffers from both problems and different strategies were used to address these issues.

Item non-response was addressed by two strategies:
– For sensitive questions that may generate negative reactions from the respondent, such as corruption or tax evasion, enumerators were instructed to collect the refusal to respond as (-8) as a different option from don't know (-9).
– Establishments with incomplete information were re-contacted in order to complete this information, whenever necessary. However, there were clear cases of low response.

Survey non-response was addressed by maximising efforts to contact establishments that were initially selected for interviews. From the start of fieldwork until May 2013, up to 10 attempts were made to contact an establishment for interview at different times/days of the week before a replacement establishment (with similar strata characteristics) was suggested for interview. After May 2013, this was reduced to 7 attempts. Survey non-response did occur, but substitutions were made in order to potentially achieve strata-specific goals. Further research is needed on survey non-response in BEEPS regarding potential introduction of bias.

Details on rejection rates, eligibility rates, and item non-response are available at the strata level. This report summarized these numbers to alert researchers to these issues when using the data and when making inferences. Item non-response, selection bias and faulty sampling frames are not unique to BEEPS. All Enterprise Surveys suffer from these shortcomings, but in very few cases they have been made explicit.

5   BEEPS Database

5.1   Database structure

The structure of the database reflects the fact that three different versions of the questionnaire were used. The basic questionnaire, the Core Module, includes all common questions asked to all establishments from all sectors (manufacturing, services and IT). The second expanded variation, the Manufacturing Questionnaire, is built upon the Core Module and adds some specific questions relevant to the sector. The third expanded variation, the Services Module, is also built upon the Core Module and adds to the core specific questions relevant to either retail or IT. Each variation of the questionnaire is identified by the index variable, *a0*.

All variables are named using, first, the letter of each section and, second, the number of the variable within the section (i.e., *a1* denotes section A, question 1). Variable names preceded by "*eca*" indicate questions specific to BEEPS (Table 6 identifies these questions), and therefore, they may not be found in the implementation of Enterprise Surveys in other parts of the world. All other suffixed variables are global and are present in all country surveys over the world. All variables are numeric, with the exception of the variables ending with "*x*". The suffix "*x*" denotes that the variable is alpha-numeric.

Table 6: Variable names preceeded by "eca" - BEEPS IV and BEEPS V

BEEPS IV	BEEPS V			
	Main Questionnaire	Innovation Module	Gender Module [Turkey only]	Coin Toss Experiment [Ukraine and Turkey only]
ecae30	ecaq5	ecao1a	ecaz1	ecat1
ecab7a	ecaq5x	ecao1bx	ecaz2	ecat2
ecad8a	ecac31a1	ecao2a	ecaz3	ecat3
ecao1	ecac31a2	ecao2b	ecaz4	ecat4
ecao2	ecac31a3	ecao2c	ecaz5	ecat5
ecao3	ecaq15a	ecao3a	ecaz6a	ecat6
ecao6	ecad31b1	ecao3b	ecaz6b	ecat7
ecao14	ecad31b2	ecao3c	ecaz6c	ecat8
ecao15	ecad31b3	ecao3d	ecaz6d	ecat9
ecao15x	ecaq53	ecao3e	ecaz7	ecat10
ecaw1	ecah4	ecao3f	ecaz8	ecat11
ecaw2	ecah8	ecao3fx	ecaz8x	ecat12
ecaw3	ecai31a1	ecao3g	ecaz9	ecat13a
ecaw30	ecai31a2	ecao4	ecaz9x	ecat13b
ecap1	ecai31a3	ecao5	ecaz10	ecat13bx
ecap2	ecak4a	ecao5x	ecaz10x	
ecap3	ecak9a	ecao6	ecaz11	
ecap4	ecak9ax	ecao7a	ecaz11x	
ecap5	ecaq46f	ecao7b	ecaz12	
ecap6	ecaq46fx	ecao7c	ecaz13	
ecap7	ecaq46d	ecao8x	ecaz13x	
ecap30	ecaq46e	ecao9a	ecaz14	
ecag9	ecak15a1	ecao9b	ecaz15	
ecag10	ecak17	ecao9c		
ecag11	ecaq31e	ecao10a		
ecag12	ecaj1b	ecao10b		
ecag13	ecaj1c	ecao10c		
ecag14	ecaj31b1	ecao10d		
ecak5b	ecaj31b2	ecao11		
ecaj1b	ecaj31b3	ecao11x		
ecaj1c	ecaj31c1	ecao12		
ecaj5a	ecaj31c2	ecao13		
ecaj14a	ecaj31c3	ecao14a		
ecaq69	ecaj31f1	ecao14b		
ecaq69x	ecaj31f2	ecao14c		

BEEPS IV	BEEPS V			
	Main Questionnaire	Innovation Module	Gender Module [Turkey only]	Coin Toss Experiment [Ukraine and Turkey only]
	ecaj31f3	ecao14d		
	ecah31a1	ecao14e		
	ecah31a2	ecao14f		
	ecah31a3	ecao15a		
	ecaq39	ecao15b		
	ecaq41a	ecao15c		
	ecaq41b	ecao15d		
	ecaq41c	ecao16		
	ecaq44a	ecao17		
	ecaq44b	ecao18		
	ecaq44c	ecao19		
	ecar16a	ecao20		
	ecar17a	ecao21		
	ecar17b	ecao22a		
	ecar17c	ecao22b		
	ecar18	ecao23a		
	ecar20	ecao23b		
	ecar20x	ecao23cx		
	ecaq69	ecao23d		
	ecal31a1	ecar1		
	ecal31a2	ecar2		
	ecal31a3	ecar6		
	ecal31b1	ecar7		
	ecal31b2	ecar8		
	ecal31b3	ecar11		
	ecas1a	ecar13		
	ecas1b	ecar15		
	ecas1c	ecaa15a4d		
	ecaa15a4a			
	ecaa15a4b			
	ecaa15a4c			

There are two establishment identifiers, *idstd* and *id*. The first is a global unique identifier. The second is a country unique identifier. The variables *a2* (sampling region), *a6a* (sampling establishment's size) and *a4a* (sampling sector) contain the establishment's classification into the strata chosen for each country using information from the sampling frame. The strata were defined according to the guidelines described above and in country-specific information.

There are three levels of stratification: industry, size and region. Different combinations of these variables generate the strata cells for each industry/region/size combination. A distinction should be made between the variable *a4a* (sampling sector) and *d1a2* (industry expressed as ISIC rev. 3.1 code). The former gives the establishment's classification into one of the chosen industry-strata, whereas the latter gives the actual establishment's industry classification (four digit code) in the sampling frame.

All of the following variables contain information from the sampling frame and were defined with the sampling design. They may not coincide with the reality of individual establishments as sampling frames

may contain inaccurate information. The variables containing the sampling frame information are included in the data set for researchers who may want to further investigate statistical features of the survey and the effect of the survey design on their results:

- *a2* is the variable describing sampling regions
- *a6a*: coded using the same standard for small, medium, and large establishments as defined above. The code -9 was used to indicate units for which size was missing in the sampling frame
- *a4a*: coded using ISIC codes for the chosen industries for stratification. These codes include most manufacturing industries (15 to 37), retail (52) and other services (45, 50, 51, 55, 60-64, 72)
- *id2009*: contains the firm ids of the panel firms from BEEPS IV

The surveys were implemented following a two-stage procedure. In the first stage, a screener questionnaire was typically applied over the phone to determine eligibility and to make appointments. In the second stage, a face-to-face interview took place with the Manager/Owner/Director of each establishment. The variables *a4b* and *a6b* contain the industry and size of the establishment from the screener questionnaire. Variables *a8* to *a11* contain additional information and were also collected in the screening phase.

There are additional variables for location (*a3x*), industry (*d1a2*) and size (*l1*, *l6* and *l8*) that reflect more accurately the reality of each establishment:

- Variable *a3x* indicates the actual location of the establishment. There may be divergencies between the location in the sampling frame and the actual location, as the establishment may be listed in one place but the actual physical location is in another place.
- Variable *d1a2* indicates the actual ISIC code of the main output of the establishment as answered by the respondent. This is probably the most accurate variable to classify establishments by activity.
- Variables *l1*, *l6* and *l8* were designed to obtain a more accurate measure of employment accounting for permanent and temporary employment. Special efforts were made to make sure that this information was not missing for most establishments.
- Variable *a17x* gives interviewer comments, including problems that occurred during an interview and extraordinary circumstances which could influence results. Please note that sometimes this variable is removed due to privacy issues.

Note that certain variables (including *a3x*, actual location of the establishment) have been removed from the public version of the dataset for confidentiality reasons.

The "last complete fiscal year" generally refers to 2011, while "three fiscal years ago" refers to 2009. Exceptions are listed in Table 7 below.

Table 7: Fiscal year reference exceptions in BEEPS V

	Contractor	Last complete fiscal year	3 fiscal years ago
Czech Republic	Ipsos Tambor	2011	2009
	Median and Data Collect	2012	2010
Russia		2010	2008
Slovak Republic	Ipsos Tambor	2011	2009
	Median and ACRC	2012	2010
Turkey	Ipsos Turkey	2011	2009
	Yontem	2012	2010

5.2 Weights

Since the sampling design was stratified and employed differential sampling, individual observations should be properly weighted when making inferences about the population. Under stratified random sampling unweighted estimates are biased unless sample sizes are proportional to the size of each

stratum. With stratification the probability of selection of each unit is, in general, not the same. Consequently, individual observations must be weighted by the inverse of their probability of selection (probability weights or *pw* in Stata).[2]

Special care was given to the correct computation of weights. Considering the varying quality of the sampling frames, it was imperative to accurately adjust the totals within each region/industry/size stratum to account for the presence of ineligible units (the firm discontinued business or was unattainable, education or government establishments, non-panel establishments with less than 5 employees, no reply after having called on different days of the week and at different business hours, out of order, no tone in the phone line, answering machine, fax line, wrong address or moved away and could not get the new reference). The information required for the adjustment was collected in the first stage of the implementation, during the screening process. Using this information, each stratum cell of the universe was scaled down by the observed proportion of ineligible units within the cell. Once an accurate estimate of the universe cell (projections) was available, weights were computed using the number of completed interviews. Note that panel firms with less than 5 employees were also included in the eligible sample and special code zero was used in *a6a* and *a6b* (sample and screener size) to reflect those cases.

For some units it was impossible to determine eligibility because the contact was not successfully completed. Consequently, different assumptions as to their eligibility result in different universe cells' adjustments and in different sampling weights. Three sets of assumptions were considered:
1. *Strict assumption*: Eligible establishments are only those for which it was possible to directly determine eligibility. The resulting weights are included in the variable *wstrict*.
2. *Median assumption*: Eligible establishments are those for which it was possible to directly determine eligibility and those that rejected the screener questionnaire or an answering machine or fax was the only response. The resulting weights are included in the variable *wmedian*.
3. *Weak assumption*: In addition to the establishments included in the first two points, all establishments for which it was not possible to finalize a contact are assumed to be eligible. This includes establishments with dead or out of service phone lines, establishments that never answered the phone, and establishments with incorrect addresses for which it was impossible to find a new address. The resulting weights are included in the variable *wweak*. Note that under the weak assumption only observed non-eligible units are excluded from universe projections.

Table 8 summarizes the eligibility criteria for each of the above three assumptions.

Within each of these assumptions regarding eligibility a pair of weight sets was calculated. The first set of estimates calculated proportions using the raw sample count for each cell. However, the achieved sample numbers in many cells were small. Hence, those eligibility rates, and the adjusted universe cells projections, are subject to relatively large sampling variations. Therefore a second set of more robust estimates (collapsed weights) was also produced where needed. Those estimates made use of the multiples of the relative eligibility rates for each industry, size and region. Those relative rates were based on much larger samples than the individual cells and thus produced values with smaller sampling variations. The dataset includes only these robust weights where applicable.

Note that for the purpose of the weights computations all panel firms were considered to be part of the current universe, although technically they are not randomly selected.

---

[2] This is equivalent to the weighted average of the estimates for each stratum, with weights equal to the population shares of each stratum.

Table 8: Eligibility criteria

Status Code	Eligibility Criteria		
	Strict	**Weak**	**Median**
1. Eligible establishment (Correct name and address)	1	1	1
2. Eligible establishment (Different name but same address - the new firm/establishment bought the original firm/establishment)	1	1	1
3. Eligible establishment (Different name but same address - the firm/establishment changed its name)	1	1	1
4. Eligible establishment (Wrong address - the firm/establishment has changed address and the address could be found)	1	1	1
16. Panel firm - now less than five employees	1	1	1
5. The establishment has less than 5 permanent full time employees	0	0	0
6. The firm discontinued businesses	0	0	0
7. Not a business: Private household	0	0	0
8. Ineligible activity: education, agriculture, finances, governments…	0	0	0
91. No reply (after having called in different days of the week and in different business hours)	0	1	0
92. Line out of order	0	1	0
93. No tone	0	1	0
10. Answering machine	0	1	1
11. Fax line – data line	0	1	1
12. Wrong address/ moved away and could not get the new references	0	1	0
13. Refuses to answer the screener	0	1	1
14. In process *(the establishment is being called/ is being contacted – previous to ask the screener)*	0	0	0
151. Out of target – outside the covered regions, firm moved abroad	0	0	0
152. Out of target – firm moved abroad	0	0	0

Strict eligibility = (Sum of the numbers with codes 1,2,3,4,&16) / Total
Weak eligibility = (Sum of the numbers with codes 1,2,3,4,16,91,92,93,10,11,12,&13) / Total
Median eligibility = (Sum of the numbers with codes 1,2,3,4,16,10,11, & 13) / Total

5.2.1 Appropriate use of the weights

As discussed above, under stratified random sampling weights should be used when making inferences about the population. Any estimate or indicator that aims at describing some feature of the population should take into account that individual observations may not represent equal shares of the population.

However, there is some discussion as to the use of weights in regressions (see Deaton, 1997, p.67; Lohr, 1999, chapter 11, Cochran, 1977, p. 150). There is not strong large sample econometric argument in favour of using weighted estimation for a common population coefficient if the underlying model varies per stratum (stratum-specific coefficient): both simple OLS and weighted OLS are inconsistent under regular conditions. However, weighted OLS has the advantage of providing an estimate that is independent of the sample design. This latter point may be quite relevant for BEEPS as in most cases the objective is not only to obtain model-unbiased estimates but also design-unbiased estimates (see also Cochran, 1977, p. 200 who favours the use of weighted OLS for a common population coefficient).[3]

For a more general approach, if the regressions are descriptive of the population then weights should be used. The estimated model can be thought of as the relationship that would be expected if the whole population were observed.[4] If the models are developed as structural relationships or behavioural models that may vary for different parts of the population, then there is no reason to use weights.

---

[3] Note that weighted OLS in Stata using the command regress with the option of weights will estimate wrong standard errors. Using the Stata survey specific commands svy will provide appropriate standard errors.

[4] The use of weights in most model-assisted estimations using survey data is strongly recommended by the statisticians specialised on survey methodology of the JPSM of the University of Michigan and the University of Maryland.

6 Bibliography

1. Cochran, William G. Sampling Techniques. 3rd edition. Wiley, 1977. 428 pages.
2. Deaton, Angus. The Analysis of Household Surveys: A Microeconomic Approach to Development Policy. World Bank Publications, 1997. 488 pages.
3. Levy, Paul S. and Stanley Lemeshow. Sampling of Populations: Methods and Applications. 3rd edition. Wiley, 1999. 568 pages.
4. Lohr, Sharon L. Sampling: Design and Analysis. 1st edition. Duxbury Press, 1999. 512 pages.
5. Schaeffer, Richard L., William Mendenhall and Lyman Ott. Elementary Survey Sampling, 5th edition. Duxbury Press, 1996.

Annex A   Country-specific information on BEEPS survey

A.1   Albania

A.1.1. Sampling structure and implementation

A suitable sampling frame does not exist for Albania. Because of this, the design returned to first principles, using a blocks enumeration methodology. Detailed maps of major cities were obtained from aerial mappings projected to a usable scale. They served as the basis of a multi-stage approach: Each city was divided into "blocks" and then the blocks were classified into strata defined by the predominant spatial use, using local knowledge. The classifications used for the blocks included industrial, commercial, commercial/residential (mixed), and residential coding.

Before the enumerated establishments could be selected it was first necessary to remove any that had been selected for use in the BEEPS IV. The selected sample had two components:
- The BEEPS IV sample that met eligibility criteria was used in its entirety.
- Then available enumerated blocks were selected.

Regional stratification was defined in four regions. These regions are Tirana, Durres and Shkoder, Elbasan and Korce, and, Fier and Vlore.

Regions (official administrative counties)	Grouping used for stratification purposes in BEEPS V
Tirana	Tirana
Durrës	Durres and Shkoder
Shkodër	
Fier	Fier and Vlore
Vlorë	
Elbasan	Elbasan and Korce
Korçë	
Berat	Not covered
Dibër	Not covered
Gjirokastër	Not covered
Kukës	Not covered
Lezhë	Not covered

Blocks were selected and enumerated; building by building, floor by floor. Each separate unit was identified, classified as to use and in the case of business establishments further details collected as to employee numbers, activity, name, and phone number. This enumeration was then employed to project to universe totals by reference to the screening results and the number of blocks in each stratum. The establishments enumerated in those blocks were then used as the frame for the selection of the BEEPS V sample. The percentage of confirmed non-eligible units as a proportion of the total number of contacts to complete the survey was 11.1% (50 out of 449 establishments).

Fresh sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Durres and Shkoder	5-19	24	25	56	105
	20-99	9	7	12	28
	100+	6	0	0	6
	Total	39	32	68	139
Elbasan and Korce	5-19	30	11	91	132
	20-99	8	0	2	10
	100+	1	0	0	1
	Total	39	11	93	143
Fier and Vlore	5-19	16	9	43	68
	20-99	8	0	4	12
	100+	1	0	2	3
	Total	25	9	49	83
Tirana	5-19	177	77	220	474
	20-99	38	15	25	78
	100+	6	0	4	10
	Total	221	92	249	562
Grand Total		324	144	459	927

Sources: Block enumeration in 2012.

Panel sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Durres and Shkoder	5-19	2	0	3	5
	20-99	5	0	4	9
	100+	2	0	0	2
	Total	9	0	7	16
Elbasan and Korce	5-19	2	0	4	6
	20-99	0	0	3	3
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	2	0	7	9
Fier and Vlore	5-19	4	0	7	11
	20-99	6	0	0	6
	100+	1	0	0	1
	Total	11	0	7	18
Tirana	5-19	20	30	33	83
	20-99	17	5	20	42
	100+	5	0	1	6
	Total	42	35	54	131
Grand Total		64	35	75	174

Source: BEEPS IV.

Original sample design

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Durres and Shkoder	5-19	6	17	8	31
	20-99	4	4	2	10
	100+	2	0	0	2
	Total	12	21	10	43
Elbasan and Korce	5-19	9	7	21	37
	20-99	2	0	2	4
	100+	1	0	0	1
	Total	12	7	23	42
Fier and Vlore	5-19	7	6	7	20
	20-99	5	0	1	6
	100+	1	0	1	2
	Total	13	6	9	28
Tirana	5-19	61	72	70	203
	20-99	17	14	6	37
	100+	5	0	2	7
	Total	83	86	78	247
Grand Total		120	120	120	360

A.1.2. Status codes

	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Complete interviews **(Total)**	360	240	120
Incomplete interviews	1	0	1
Elegible in process	0	0	0
Refusals	3	0	3
Out of target	50	33	17
Impossible to contact	23	2	21
Ineligible - coop.	0	0	0
Refusal to the Screener	12	12	0
Total	449	287	162

	ELIGIBLES			
Eligible	1.Elegible establishment (Correct name and address)	364	240	124
	2. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the new firm/establishment bought the original firm/establishment)	0	0	0
	3. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the firm/establishment changed its name)	0	0	0
	4. Elegible establishment (Wrong address - the firm/establishmen has changed address and the address could be found)	0	0	0
	16. Panel firm - now less than five employees	0	0	0
Ineligible	5. The establishment has less than 5 permanent full time employees	11	10	1
	6. The firm discontinued businesses	29	13	16
	7. Not a business: private household	0	0	0
	8. Ineligible activity: education, agriculture, finances, governments…	10	10	0
Unobtainable	91. No reply *(after having called in different days of the week and in different business hours)*	0	0	0
	92. Line out of order	0	0	0
	93. No tone	0	0	0
	94. Phone number does not exist	0	0	0
	10. Answering machine	0	0	0
	11. Fax line - data line	0	0	0
	12. Wrong address/ moved away and could not get the new references	23	2	21
	13. Refuses to answer the screener	12	12	0
	14. In process *(the establishment is being called/ is being contacted - previous to ask the screener)*	0	0	0
	151. Out of target - outside the covered regions, firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	152. Out of target - firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	153. Impossible to find	0	0	0
	Total	449	287	162

A.1.3. Survey and item non-response

The number of completed interviews per contacted establishment was 0.80.[5] This number is the result of two factors: explicit refusals to participate in the survey, as reflected by the rate of rejection (which includes rejections of the screener and the main survey) and the quality of the sampling frame, as represented by the presence of ineligible units. The number of rejections per contact was 0.03.

---

[5] The estimate is based on the total number of firms contacted including ineligible establishments.

A.1.4. Local agency team involved in the study and its comments on the implementation

Local agency team involved in the survey

Local agency	Name: Ipsos – Strategic Puls Research Country: Albania Membership of international organisation: ESOMAR Activities since: August 2005
Name of Project Manager	Alban Bilali
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Briken Qinami, Fieldwork Manager Tatjana Vukovic, Data entry and CATI
Enumerators involved	Enumerators who only conducted the screener: 2 Interviewers who only conducted interviews: 10 Interviewers who conducted screener and interviews: 14
Other staff involved	Editing: 2 Data entry: 8 Data processing: 3

Sampling frame

Characteristic of sample frame used	Block enumeration was conducted in January 2013, and together with the list of panel firms was used as a sample frame.
Source	Block enumeration
Year of publication	Not applicable
Comments on the quality of the sample frame	Sample frame was based on previously enumerated data, so it was of a high quality.
Year and organisation that conducted the last economic census	Not applicable

Sample

Comments/problems on sectors and regions selected in the sample	Fieldwork was conducted in 7 districts: Tirana, Durres, Fier, Vlore, Elbasan, Korçë, Shkodër
Comments on the response rate	Response rate was high.
Comments on the sample design	No problems in achieving the sampling design.

Fieldwork

Date of fieldwork	March 2013 – July 2013
Country	Albania
Number of completed interviews	360
Problems found during fieldwork	The main reason respondents refused either to take part or provide financial data or information about the number of employees was because they were concerned that interviewers were from the tax office even though interviewers carry IDs. The fieldwork was done mostly before the general elections in the country and this had an impact on the fieldwork. In general, the economy has been affected by the financial crisis meaning businesses were less motivated to take part in the survey.
Actions taken to improve response rate/deal with problems during fieldwork	To encourage response, experienced researchers were directly contacting the respondents to put them at ease about the project. The interviewers were trained, and reminded throughout fieldwork of the importance of not giving up on soft refusals. In addition, we offered a small incentive to encourage response.

Questionnaires

Problems for the understanding of questions (write question number)	• D2 - The declaration of the total yearly sales proved to be difficult because respondents were not willing to give this information. • K15 - We found that a lot of respondents struggled to understand the

	questions about outstanding credits and loans, and that interviewers had to spend longer explaining this question.
Problems found in the navigability of questionnaires (for example, skip patterns)	No problems
Comments on questionnaire length	The questionaires are a bit long and the respondents complained about this.
Suggestions or other comments on the questionnaires	Respondents mainly answered "don't know" or "refusal" to questions L30, J6, J5, J30a, J30b and M1, because of fear of action by tax officials.

Quality control

Fieldwork monitoring	The monitoring was done for every city and for every interviewer. The interviewers involved did the enumeration to build the sample. Interviewers sometimes had to return to complete the innovation module, because it was not always done correctly. Interviewers who had low response rates and had high response rates were monitored carefully. Quality control checks were done on an ongoing basis to make sure errors were spotted quickly.
Data checking procedures	The same data entry program was used in another four countries in the region, so as soon as first interviews were completed, checks were done in order to ensure there were no scripting/routing errors. Later on, specially developed syntaxes for checking routing errors, assumption inconsistencies, and for detecting the proportion of refusals at certain questions were applied at various stages of data collection to ensure the quality of data. In that way, if any inconsistencies occurred, they could be promptly checked with the respondent.
Number of respondents selected for back-checking	165
Selection procedures	Randomly selected
Who carried out back-checks?	A team of 4 interviewers who had not been involved in the BEEPs project
Mode of contact	Telephone and face to face
Number of completed interviews back-checked	120
Number of non-responses back-checked	45
Results of alternative method of contacting non-respondents	NA
Description of what was covered inthe back-checks	In the back checks these questions were asked: Company name, respondent name, number of employees, main activity of the firm, how long did the interview last it (and how long the innovation module lasted) where the interview took place, did the inteviewers cover all the relevant sections of the questionnaire
Number of completed interviews that were rejected and why	One interiew in Tirana was rejected because of a high proportion of refusals and the respondent was not in a senior management position.

Database

Data entry program chosen	SM-S (internally developed data entry program) - in this case used for CAPI
Comments on the data entry program	No comments
Comments on the data cleaning	There were no major issues during data cleaning. In cases some data were missing, or they seemed odd, these needed to be completed/checked by calling respondents once again.

Country situation

General aspects of economic, political or social situation of the country that could affect the results of the survey	
Relevant country events that	The tax year in Albania ends on 31 March, and this affected the figures

occurred during fieldwork	respondents gave and their willingness to take part. The election also had an impact on fieldwork as during the campaign businesses were less willing to take part in an interview.
Other aspects	Base on official statistics, this year there were fewer loans given to businesses and less FDI in the country as well.

A.2 Armenia

A.2.1. Sampling structure and implementation

Two sampling frames were used. The first was supplied by the World Bank and EBRD and consisted of enterprises interviewed in BEEPS IV. The World Bank and EBRD required that attempts should be made to re-interview establishments responding to the BEEPS IV survey where they were within the 4 selected geographical regions and met eligibility criteria. That sample is referred to as the Panel. The second sampling frame was based on Armenia Business Directory (SYPUR). SYPUR was considered the most reliable sampling frame that could be obtained. That frame was sent to the TNS statistical team in London to select the establishments for interview.

Regional stratification was defined in four regions. These regions are North, South East, South West, and Yerevan. Table below shows the grouping of official administrative regions into these four regions.

Regions (official administrative)	Grouping used for stratification purposes in BEEPS V
Yerevan	Yerevan
Lori	North
Shirak	
Tavush	
Aragatsotn	South West
Armavir	
Kotayk	
Ararat	South East
Gegharkunik	
Syunik	
Vayots Dzor	

The quality of the frame was assessed at the onset of the project. The frame proved to be useful though it showed positive rates of non-eligibility, repetition, non-existent units, etc. These problems are typical of establishment surveys, but given the impact these inaccuracies may have on the results, adjustments were needed when computing the appropriate weights for individual observations. The percentage of confirmed non-eligible units as a proportion of the total number of contacts to complete the survey was 6.0% (42 out of 704 establishments).

Fresh sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
North	5-19	113	216	544	544
	20-99	194	82	469	469
	100+	20	1	35	35
	Total	**327**	**299**	**422**	**1048**
South East	5-19	19	13	59	59
	20-99	26	4	62	62
	100+	9	0	17	17
	Total	**54**	**17**	**62**	**133**
South West	5-19	7	0	20	20
	20-99	42	5	74	74
	100+	12	5	12	12
	Total	**61**	**5**	**40**	**106**
Yerevan	5-19	0	0	15	15
	20-99	24	2	42	42
	100+	1	0	1	1
	Total	**25**	**2**	**31**	**58**
Grand Total		**467**	**323**	**555**	**1345**

Source: Armenia Business Directory (SPYUR).

Panel sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
North	5-19	0	0	3	3
	20-99	3	0	3	6
	100+	1	0	0	1
	Total	**4**	**0**	**6**	**10**
South East	5-19	12	7	8	27
	20-99	8	0	10	18
	100+	2	0	0	2
	Total	**22**	**7**	**18**	**47**
South West	5-19	2	0	1	3
	20-99	2	0	2	4
	100+	1	0	0	1
	Total	**5**	**0**	**3**	**8**
Yerevan	5-19	13	81	19	113
	20-99	34	32	41	107
	100+	3	2	3	8
	Total	**50**	**115**	**63**	**228**
Grand Total		**81**	**122**	**90**	**293**

Source: BEEPS IV

Original sample design

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
North	5-19	0	0	5	5
	20-99	6	1	5	12
	100+	1	0	0	1
	Total	**7**	**1**	**10**	**18**
South East	5-19	6	4	8	18
	20-99	7	1	10	18
	100+	3	0	1	4
	Total	**16**	**5**	**19**	**40**
South West	5-19	2	0	3	5
	20-99	9	2	7	18
	100+	3	0	0	3
	Total	**14**	**2**	**10**	**26**
Yerevan	5-19	26	74	39	139
	20-99	51	37	39	127
	100+	6	1	3	10
	Total	**83**	**112**	**81**	**276**
Grand Total		**120**	**120**	**120**	**360**

A.2.2. Status codes

	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Complete interviews **(Total)**	360	192	168
Incomplete interviews	0	0	0
Elegible in process	0	0	0
Refusals	2	0	2
Out of target	42	13	29
Impossible to contact	32	22	10
Ineligible - coop.	0	0	0
Refusal to the Screener	268	192	76
Total	704	419	285

	ELIGIBLES			
Eligible	1.Elegible establishment (Correct name and address)	312	172	140
	2. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the new firm/establishment bought the original firm/establishment)	2	1	1
	3. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the firm/establishment changed its name)	11	2	9
	4. Elegible establishment (Wrong address - the firm/establishmen has changed address and the address could be found)	32	17	15
	16. Panel firm - now less than five employees	5	0	5
Ineligible	5. The establishment has less than 5 permanent full time employees	0	0	0
	6. The firm discontinued businesses	42	13	29
	7. Not a business: private household	0	0	0
	8. Ineligible activity: education, agriculture, finances, governments…	0	0	0
Unobtainable	91. No reply *(after having called in different days of the week and in different business hours)*	0	0	0
	92. Line out of order	0	0	0
	93. No tone	0	0	0
	94. Phone number does not exist	0	0	0
	10. Answering machine	0	0	0
	11. Fax line - data line	0	0	0
	12. Wrong address/ moved away and could not get the new references	32	22	10
	13. Refuses to answer the screener	268	192	76
	14. In process *(the establishment is being called/ is being contacted - previous to ask the screener)*	0	0	0
	151. Out of target - outside the covered regions, firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	152. Out of target - firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	153. Impossible to find	0	0	0
	Total	704	419	285

A.2.3. Survey and item non-response

The number of completed interviews per contacted establishment was 0.51. This number is the result of two factors: explicit refusals to participate in the survey, as reflected by the rate of rejection (which includes rejections of the screener and the main survey) and the quality of the sampling frame, as represented by the presence of ineligible units. The number of rejections per contact was 0.38.

A.2.4. Local agency team involved in the study and its comments on the implementation

Local agency team involved in the survey

Local agency	Media Model LLC Country:Armenia Year started operations: 2001
Name of Project Manager	Ada Babloyan
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Tigran Harutyunyan (field manager) Bagrat Harutyunyan (data specialist) Hovannisyan Qeshishyan (administrative assistant to Project Manager)
Enumerators involved	Enumerators: 13 Recruiters: 13 Enumerators who also conducted screener (13)
Other staff involved	Fieldwork coordinators: 1 Editing: 2 Data entry:2

Sample Frame

Characteristic of sample frame used	
Source	Armenia Business Directory (SYPUR)
Year of publication	January 2013
Comments on the quality of the sample frame	Up to date, satisfactory quality. Some information is not-available, such as information on annual turnover and total sales.
Year and organisation that conducted the last economic census	2008, State Statistical Department
Other sources for companies statistics	None

Sample

Comments/problems on sectors and regions selected in the sample	Industry classification according to ISIC Rev. 3.1 is not available, hence re-coding was performed based on instructions for preparing the sample frame.
Comments on the response rate	Response rate was relatively high. Firms mostly refused to participate because they did not want to provide business related information.
Comments on the sample design	Sample design fits all required criteria for business enterprise surveys.

Fieldwork

Date of fieldwork	November 2012 - July 2013
Country	Armenia
Number of completed interviews	360
Problems found during fieldwork	A lot of refusals explained by lack of time of the firm representatives, unwillingness to provide business related data and lack of trust of any kind in surveys. To overcome all mentioned issues special sessions for confidence building and gaining-cooperation were included into the Interviewer Training agenda. For the fieldwork implementation process interviewers from the company's network were recruited, fitting the survey main criteria, particularly experience in business related surveys. Extra interviewers were trained to keep reserve team for contingency issues. The fieldwork progress was slower during the winter period, due to national holidays (New Years Eve and Christmas which took around 14 days). It was also slower during the tense political situation before and after presidential (February 18, 2013) and Yerevan Mayor's (May 05, 2013) elections. Strikes, protests and political activist movements within the country led to some kind of freezing of economic life in the country and indirectly impacted fieldwork progress. The fieldwork implementation sped up at the end of May and June, and was

	finished by the deadline defined by the client.
Other observations	

Questionnaires

Problems for the understanding of questions	• Section H: Difficult to understand what innovation is and to differentiate its types. • G1 and G6: The wording of these questions is confusing. It took time for interviewers to explain the difference between "…the land occupied by this establishment" and "…the building occupied by this establishment." • J7, Q39, Q41, Q44: Interviewers noted that they thought that some respondents did not give sincere responses. • VIN 1: Respondents find it hard to understand the difference between the five scenarios and rush through their responses giving any answer to finish the interview. • R2, R6, R7: Respondents had problems in understanding of production targets and bonuses.
Problems found in the navigability of questionnaires (for example, skip patterns)	• A7-A13: There are no instructions for skips in the main questionnaire. The skips should be based on the screener instructions. • OF, OF, R Skips: These are not detailed enough. It is not clear when to fill in the sections. • A24, skip in the first option for A15a: There is no clear instruction for skip for 1st option (yes) in A24
Comments on questionnaire length	The questionnaires take a long time to administer, which often makes the respondent nervous. In a large number of cases it was very hard to convince the respondent to answer the whole questionnaire. The length caused lack of attention and hasty/surface responses in the last part of the questionnaire. The respondents hurried to finish the survey quickly.
Suggestions or other comments on the questionnaires	The format of the questionnaire and coding tables are quite hard for interviewers to work with. The external design could be simplified e.g. adding consecutive numbering or other coding symbols or combining some questions into big tables.

Quality control

Fieldwork monitoring	On-going monitoring was performed by the field supervisor and the Project Manager to follow the sample implementation scheme, response rates and refusals to participate. Each weekly progress report was examined to check for productivity level of interviewers in the field. The schedule of meetings with the respondents was discussed with the supervisor to monitor interview length and time gaps between interviews. Once or twice a month the team of interviewers was gathered for a de-briefing on fieldwork progress, gaining cooperation problems, questionnaire filling in issues. Four interviewers had to be replaced because of low performance levels. During the last stage of fieldwork only the 5 best interviewers worked on the project to speed up the fieldwork and to ensure a high quality interviews.
Data checking procedures	At the first stage interviewers checked for wrong skips, missing information, routing problems. At the second stage the topline figures were checked by the field supervisor and Assistant to Country Project Manager to submit the filled in questionnaires to the quality control specialist. The supervisor checked for refusals to key questions and sample implementation profiles. At the third stage all submitted questionnaires were checked by the quality control specialist, going through the whole documents, making notes for any missing data, wrong codings, routing problems, etc. The questionnaires with problems were sent back to the supervisor for cross-checks during the debriefing with the interviewers. All necessary corrections were performed either in the office, or through re-contacts of the companies via telephone calls and visits.
Number of respondents selected for back-checking	72

Selection procedures	Mostly random selection. In several cases selection was made based upon interviewers' progress and level of performance.
Who carried out back-checks?	The Supervisor, Project Manager's assistant and Quality Control Specialist (an interviewer who did not participate in the main BEEPs survey and was specially trained to make checks) conducted the back-checks.
Mode of contact	Telephone, several face to face
Number of completed interviews back-checked	40
Number of non-responses back-checked	19
Results of alternative method of contacting non-respondents	N/A
Description of what was covered in the back-checks	Questions asked in back checks: Verify Company name, Verify Company Address, Names and Positions of Respondents, Number of employees, Field of activity, Details of main product, Approximate length of interview
Number of completed interviews that were rejected and why	One partial interview was conducted and rejected. The Director of a company answered part of the questions but refused to answer questions referring to the accounts. He gave the interviewer the contacts of the accounting agency they worked with. Multiple visits to the agency were unsuccessful because the person in charge of the company was always absent. The agency refused to provide the Accountant's personal contact details. The Director was contacted again but it was impossible to finish the interview.

Database

Data entry program chosen	SPSS, Web ADC
Comments on the data entry program	There is no consecutive numbering for questions in the questionnaire. General numbering of options would assist data coding, checks and speed of data entry.
Comments on the data cleaning	Ipsos was in charge of preparing data validation reports, which were used as the basis for the data cleaning. Continual changes to the data-map and data coding schemes/templates was time consuming and created additional work for the data entry specialists.

Country situation

General aspects of economic, political or social situation of the country that could affect the results of the survey	Survey implementation coincided with some rather tense political-economic events in the country including Presidential elections, changes in government bodies, some local authority elections, Yerevan Mayor's elections and civic protest movements. These events mostly impacted on fieldwork progress.
Relevant country events that occurred during fieldwork	New Year Eve and Christmas (December 31, 2012- 07 January, 2013), National Army Day (January 28, 2013), Presidential Elections (February 18, 2013), Women's day (March 08, 2013), Easter (April 01, 2013), Armenian Genocide Remembrance Day (April 24, 2013), Labor Day (May 01, 2013), Yerevan Mayors' Elections (May 05, 2013), Victory and Peace Day (May 09-10, 2013), 1st Republic Day (May 27-28, 2013)
Other aspects	None

A.3   Azerbaijan

A.3.1. Sampling structure and implementation

Two sampling frames were used. The first was supplied by the World Bank and EBRD and consisted of enterprises interviewed in BEEPS IV. The World Bank and EBRD required that attempts should be made to re-interview establishments responding to the BEEPS IV survey where they were within the selected geographical regions and met eligibility criteria. That sample is referred to as the Panel. The second frame for Azerbaijan was obtained from the State Statistical Committee of the Republic of Azerbaijan

(AZSTAT). That frame was sent to the statistical team in London to select the establishments for interview.

The quality of the frame was assessed at the onset of the project. The frame proved to be useful though it showed positive rates of non-eligibility, repetition, non-existent units, etc. These problems are typical of establishment surveys, but given the impact these inaccuracies may have on the results, adjustments were needed when computing the appropriate weights for individual observations. The percentage of confirmed non-eligible units as a proportion of the total number of contacts to complete the survey was 4.4% (76 out of 1736 establishments).

Regional stratification was defined in four regions. These regions are "Baku & Apsheronski", "Giandja-Kazakhski & Sheki-Zakatalski", "Lenkoranski & Kuba-Khachmazski", and "Aranski & Gorno-Shirvanski". Table below shows the grouping of official administrative regions into these four regions.

Regions (official economic regions)	Grouping used for stratification purposes in BEEPS V
Baku & Apsheronski	Baku & Apsheronski
Aranski	Aranski & Gorno-Shirvanski
Gorno-Shirvanski (Daghlig Shirvan)	
Giandja-Kazakhski (Ganja-Gazakh)	Giandja-Kazakhski & Sheki-Zakatalski
Sheki-Zakatalski (Shaki-Zaqatala)	
Lenkoranski	Lenkoranski & Kuba-Khachmazski
Kuba-Khachmazski (Guba-Khachmaz)	
Autonomous Republic of Nakhchivan	Not covered – landlocked exclave
Nagorno Karabakh	Not covered – disputed region
Kalbajar-Lachin	Not covered – controlled by Nagorno Karabakh

Fresh sample frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Residual	Grand Total
Aranski & Gorno-Shirvanski	5-19	33	30	158	221
	20-99	18	4	16	38
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**51**	**34**	**174**	**259**
Baku & Apsheronski	5-19	313	171	444	928
	20-99	175	72	393	640
	100+	2	9	91	102
	Total	**490**	**252**	**928**	**1670**
Giandja-Kazakhski & Sheki-Zakatalski	5-19	66	31	161	258
	20-99	23	5	55	83
	100+	0	0	6	6
	Total	**89**	**36**	**222**	**347**
Lenkoranski & Kuba-Khachmazski	5-19	22	20	78	120
	20-99	13	4	39	56
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**35**	**24**	**117**	**176**
Grand Total		**665**	**346**	**1441**	**2452**

Source: State Statistical Committee of the Republic of Azerbaijan (AZSTAT).

Panel sample frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Residual	Grand Total
Aranski & Gorno-Shirvanski	5-19	8	12	10	30
	20-99	6	3	8	17
	100+	4	0	0	4
	Total	**18**	**15**	**18**	**51**
Baku & Apsheronski	5-19	8	44	36	88
	20-99	18	23	27	68
	100+	25	4	17	46
	Total	**51**	**71**	**80**	**202**
Giandja-Kazakhski & Sheki-Zakatalski	5-19	11	16	7	34
	20-99	7	4	13	24
	100+	3	2	3	8
	Total	**21**	**22**	**23**	**66**
Lenkoranski & Kuba-Khachmazski	5-19	5	8	6	19
	20-99	4	0	9	13
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**9**	**8**	**15**	**32**
Grand Total		**99**	**116**	**136**	**351**

Source: BEEPS IV.

Original sample design

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Residual	Grand Total
Aranski & Gorno-Shirvanski	5-19	33	29	40	102
	20-99	24	18	35	77
	100+	7	9	9	25
	Total	**64**	**56**	**84**	**204**
Baku & Apsheronski	5-19	12	14	14	40
	20-99	7	6	7	20
	100+	2	1	3	6
	Total	**21**	**21**	**24**	**66**
Giandja-Kazakhski & Sheki-Zakatalski	5-19	7	13	7	27
	20-99	7	2	4	13
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**14**	**15**	**11**	**40**
Lenkoranski & Kuba-Khachmazski	5-19	8	13	14	35
	20-99	7	4	2	13
	100+	2	0	0	2
	Total	**17**	**17**	**16**	**50**
Grand Total		**116**	**109**	**135**	**360**

A.3.2. Status codes

	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Complete interviews **(Total)**	390	321	69
Incomplete interviews	0	0	0
Elegible in process	24	18	6
Refusals	24	19	5
Out of target	76	44	32
Impossible to contact	1181	1017	164
Ineligible - coop.	0	0	0
Refusal to the Screener	41	32	9
Total	1736	1451	285

	ELIGIBLES			
Eligible	1.Elegible establishment (Correct name and address)	438	358	80
	2. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the new firm/establishment bought the original firm/establishment)	0	0	0
	3. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the firm/establishment changed its name)	0	0	0
	4. Elegible establishment (Wrong address - the firm/establishmen has changed address and the address could be found)	0	0	0
	16. Panel firm - now less than five employees	0	0	0
Ineligible	5. The establishment has less than 5 permanent full time employees	11	5	6
	6. The firm discontinued businesses	48	26	22
	7. Not a business: private household	2	0	2
	8. Ineligible activity: education, agriculture, finances, governments…	15	13	2
Unobtainable	91. No reply *(after having called in different days of the week and in different business hours)*	634	532	102
	92. Line out of order	50	42	8
	93. No tone	13	8	5
	94. Phone number does not exist	70	54	16
	10. Answering machine	1	0	1
	11. Fax line - data line	0	0	0
	12. Wrong address/ moved away and could not get the new references	413	381	32
	13. Refuses to answer the screener	41	32	9
	14. In process *(the establishment is being called/ is being contacted - previous to ask the screener)*	0	0	0
	151. Out of target - outside the covered regions, firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	152. Out of target - firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	153. Impossible to find	0	0	0
	Total	1736	1451	285

A.3.3. Survey and item non-response

The number of completed interviews per contacted establishment was 0.22. This number is the result of two factors: explicit refusals to participate in the survey, as reflected by the rate of rejection (which includes rejections of the screener and the main survey) and the quality of the sampling frame, as represented by the presence of ineligible units. The number of rejections per contact was 0.04.

A.3.4. Local agency team involved in the study and its comments on the implementation

Local agency team involved in the survey

Local agency	Name: SIAR Research and Consulting Group Country: Azerbaijan Membership of international organisation: N/A Active since: 1993
Name of Project Manager	Leyla Mehtiyeva/Gunay Jafarkuliyeva
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Ashraf Hajiyev, Project Director Nigar Huseynzade, Field Manager
Enumerators involved	Enumerators: N/A Recruiters: 4 but they were split into a) identification of the company; b) recruitment for interview Both: 42
Other staff involved	Fieldwork Coordinators: 2 Data Editing: 1 Data Entry: 2 Data Processing: 1

Sampling frame

Characteristic of sample frame used	Database of State Statistics Committee of Azerbaijan
Source	State Statistics Committee of Azerbaijan
Year of publication	2012
Comments on the quality of the sample frame	At first we had some problems with sample frame, as it was old. For example, some companies did not exist or were out of business several years ago. Sometimes we faced the problems related to contact information, as it was old and we needed to find it by ourselves. As a result we worked on several sources and this factor lengthened the duration of fieldwork.
Year and organisation that conducted the last economic census	-
Other sources for companies statistics	-

Sample

Comments/problems on sectors and regions selected in the sample	As the enterprises or contact information of enterprises were old, the local agency had to find the necessary information. At the end of fieldwork there were difficulties with the Giandja & Kazakhski region because it was impossible to find other retail enterprises to interview. In the end this region was replaced with Baku & Apsheronski.
Comments on the response rate	No comments
Comments on the sample design	Sample design was clear.

Fieldwork

Date of fieldwork	February 2013 – August 2013
Country	Azerbaijan
Number of completed interviews	390
Problems found during fieldwork	Some respondents did not want to provide the real details of their turnover and refused to answer that question. Also they refused to provide the real number of employees working in those enterprises. The biggest problem during fieldwork was the sample, as it was old, most of addresses and contact numbers did not exist or were changed.
Other observations	

Questionnaires

Problems for the understanding of questions (write question number)	Question number: • K.7: Respondents had difficulties with term Overdraft • b) K.6: Some did not understand the meaning of checking or savings account
Problems found in the navigability of questionnaires (for example, skip patterns)	No comments
Comments on questionnaire length	Questionnaire was long and it took a lot of time to answer the questions. Before the interview respondents were informed about approximate duration of the interview. Some respondents were busy and asked the interviewer to wait, so interview lasted longer than it was intended.
Suggestions or other comments on the questionnaires	It would be better if the questionnaire was written in less official language, as some of respondents had difficulties with terms, and it took additional time to explain such terms. Also we suggest adding "Other" to the question M.1 if none of the mentioned answers apply to the respondent.

Quality control

Fieldwork monitoring	We checked the work of both recruiters and the interviewers. Three interviewers were retrained due to incorrect routing and high number of refusals. People engaged into recruitment were also additionally trained on calling in different parts of the day to ensure that we made all efforts to find the respondent.
Data checking procedures	There was a constant logic check of all the interviews in parallel to fieldwork procedures. Besides logic checks, we were also checked the share of refusals.
Number of respondents selected for back-checking	50
Selection procedures	Random selection among each interviewer's questionnaires
Who carried out back-checks?	The back-check was conducted by a special quality control team, which is supervised by the General Manager of SIAR.
Mode of contact	Telephone
Number of completed interviews back-checked	40
Number of non-responses back-checked	10 (2 were out of country, 8 were busy but approved their participation in the interview)
Results of alternative method of contacting non-respondents	N/A
Description of what was covered inthe back-checks	The name of the entity, sector, key products/services, length of interview, usage of show-cards, etc.
Number of completed interviews that were rejected and why	N/A

Database

Data entry program chosen	SPSS, WebADC
Comments on the data entry program	-
Comments on the data cleaning	-

Country situation

General aspects of economic, political or social situation of the country that could affect the results of the survey	-
Relevant country events that occurred during fieldwork	Holidays: International Women Day (March 8), Novruz (March 20-21), Victory Day (May, 9), Independence Day (May 28), Armed Forces Day (June, 26), Ramadan (August, 8-9).

Other aspects	None

A.4 Belarus

A.4.1. Sampling structure and implementation

Two sample frames were used. The first was supplied by the World Bank and EBRD and consisted of enterprises interviewed in BEEPS IV. The World Bank and EBRD required that attempts should be made to re-interview establishments responding to the BEEPS IV survey where they were within the selected geographical regions and met eligibility criteria. That sample is referred to as the Panel. The second sample frame is from the Information enterprise "Komlev-Info" and is an electronic database "Register Belarus Enterprises".

The quality of the frame was assessed at the onset of the project. The frame proved to be useful though it showed positive rates of non-eligibility, repetition, non-existent units, etc. These problems are typical of establishment surveys, but given the impact these inaccuracies may have on the results, adjustments were needed when computing the appropriate weights for individual observations. The percentage of confirmed non-eligible units as a proportion of the total number of contacts to complete the survey was 5.5% (45 out of 814 establishments).

Regional stratification was defined in 7 regions. These regions are Minskaya, Vitebskaya, Brestskaya, Mogilevskaya, Gomelskaya, Grodnenskaya, and Minsk (official economic regions).

Regions (official economic regions)	Grouping used for stratification purposes in BEEPS V
Minsk	Minsk
Brestskaya	Brestskaya
Gomelskaya	Gomelskaya
Grodenskaya	Grodenskaya
Mogilevskaya	Mogilevskaya
Minskaya	Minskaya
Vitebskaya	Vitebskaya

Fresh sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Brestskaya	5-19	171	737	1887	2795
	20-99	232	193	814	1239
	100+	223	42	450	715
	Total	**626**	**972**	**1553**	**3151**
Gomelskaya	5-19	158	702	1648	2508
	20-99	158	222	741	1121
	100+	167	32	381	580
	Total	**483**	**956**	**1331**	**2770**
Grodnenskaya	5-19	267	673	1908	2848
	20-99	220	172	716	1108
	100+	164	32	284	480
	Total	**651**	**877**	**1380**	**2908**
Minsk	5-19	975	1073	6402	8450
	20-99	674	494	2851	4019
	100+	256	85	738	1079
	Total	**1905**	**1652**	**6434**	**9991**
Minskaya	5-19	224	652	1710	2586
	20-99	276	124	739	1139
	100+	226	27	423	676
	Total	**726**	**803**	**1343**	**2872**
Mogilevskaya	5-19	132	546	1247	1925
	20-99	106	157	555	818
	100+	123	18	251	392
	Total	**361**	**721**	**971**	**2053**
Vitebskaya	5-19	106	500	1140	1746
	20-99	153	159	598	910
	100+	147	30	291	468
	Total	**406**	**689**	**934**	**2029**
Grand Total		**5158**	**6670**	**13946**	**25774**

Source: Register Belarus. Enterprises August 2012.

Panel sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Brestskaya	5-19	2	3	0	5
	20-99	3	3	0	6
	100+	5	2	3	10
	Total	**10**	**8**	**3**	**21**
Gomelskaya	5-19	4	3	4	11
	20-99	4	4	3	11
	100+	4	1	2	7
	Total	**12**	**8**	**9**	**29**
Grodnenskaya	5-19	7	4	4	15
	20-99	2	2	2	6
	100+	5	1	2	8
	Total	**14**	**7**	**8**	**29**
Minsk	5-19	6	3	0	9
	20-99	2	2	3	7
	100+	5	2	3	10
	Total	**13**	**7**	**6**	**26**
Minskaya	5-19	5	2	1	8
	20-99	4	3	2	9
	100+	0	1	2	3
	Total	**9**	**6**	**5**	**20**
Mogilevskaya	5-19	4	3	4	11
	20-99	3	5	2	10
	100+	4	1	5	10
	Total	**11**	**9**	**11**	**31**
Vitebskaya	5-19	2	7	2	11
	20-99	5	2	2	9
	100+	3	2	1	6
	Total	**10**	**11**	**5**	**26**
Grand Total		**79**	**56**	**47**	**182**

Source: BEEPS IV.

Original sample design

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Brestskaya	5-19	5	11	11	27
	20-99	6	4	2	12
	100+	5	2	2	9
	Total	**16**	**17**	**15**	**48**
Gomelskaya	5-19	5	11	8	24
	20-99	4	4	2	10
	100+	5	2	2	9
	Total	**14**	**17**	**12**	**43**
Grodnenskaya	5-19	6	11	11	28
	20-99	5	4	2	11
	100+	5	2	2	9
	Total	**16**	**17**	**15**	**48**
Minsk	5-19	16	17	25	58
	20-99	12	8	20	40
	100+	6	2	3	11
	Total	**34**	**27**	**48**	**109**
Minskaya	5-19	5	10	9	24
	20-99	6	3	2	11
	100+	5	2	2	9
	Total	**16**	**15**	**13**	**44**
Mogilevskaya	5-19	4	9	5	18
	20-99	4	3	2	9
	100+	4	2	2	8
	Total	**12**	**14**	**9**	**35**
Vitebskaya	5-19	4	8	4	16
	20-99	4	3	2	9
	100+	4	2	2	8
	Total	**12**	**13**	**8**	**33**
Grand Total		**120**	**120**	**120**	**360**

A.4.2. Status codes

	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Complete interviews **(Total)**	360	239	121
Incomplete interviews	0	0	0
Elegible in process	0	0	0
Refusals	124	93	31
Out of target	45	40	5
Impossible to contact	33	28	5
Ineligible - coop.	3	3	0
Refusal to the Screener	249	215	34
Total	814	618	196

	ELIGIBLES	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Eligible	1.Elegible establishment (Correct name and address)	483	331	152
	2. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the new firm/establishment bought the original firm/establishment)	0	0	0
	3. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the firm/establishment changed its name)	0	0	0
	4. Elegible establishment (Wrong address - the firm/establishmen has changed address and the address could be found)	1	1	0
	16. Panel firm - now less than five employees	0	0	0
Ineligible	5. The establishment has less than 5 permanent full time employees	4	4	0
	6. The firm discontinued businesses	30	25	5
	7. Not a business: private household	0	0	0
	8. Ineligible activity: education, agriculture, finances, governments…	11	11	0
Unobtainable	91. No reply *(after having called in different days of the week and in different business hours)*	30	25	5
	92. Line out of order	0	0	0
	93. No tone	0	0	0
	94. Phone number does not exist	0	0	0
	10. Answering machine	0	0	0
	11. Fax line - data line	0	0	0
	12. Wrong address/ moved away and could not get the new references	3	3	0
	13. Refuses to answer the screener	249	215	34
	14. In process *(the establishment is being called/ is being contacted - previous to ask the screener)*	0	0	0
	151. Out of target - outside the covered regions, firm moved abroad	3	3	0
	152. Out of target - firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	153. Impossible to find	0	0	0
	Total	814	618	196

A.4.3. Survey and item non-response

The number of completed interviews per contacted establishment was 0.44. This number is the result of two factors: explicit refusals to participate in the survey, as reflected by the rate of rejection (which includes rejections of the screener and the main survey) and the quality of the sample frame, as represented by the presence of ineligible units. The number of rejections per contact was 0.46.

A.4.4. Local agency team involved in the study and its comments on the implementation

Local agency team involved in the survey

Local agency	Name: Centre of Political and Social Research Country: Belarus Membership of international organisation: N/A Activities since: 1997
Name of Project Manager	Irina Levitskaya
Name and position of other key persons of the project	David Rotman – Project Director Larissa Filinskaya – Field Manager Liudmila Soloviova – Head of Data Processing Anna Markovic – Project Administrator
Interviewers involved	Enumerators who only conducted the screener: 1 Interviewers who only conducted interviews: 60 Interviewers who conducted screener and interviews: 8
Other staff involved	Fieldwork Coordinators: 7 Editing: 9 people Data Entry: 4 person Data Processing: 2 person

Sampling frame

Characteristic of sample frame used	Sample frame is based on e-guide provided by data company "Komlev-Info"
Source	Sources of statistical information: Electronic database "Register-Belarus Enterprises - August 2012
Year of publication	Databases updated monthly but extracted in 2012
Comments on the quality of the sample frame	The information in the sample frame was complete and accurate in the majority of cases
Year and organisation that conducted the last economic census	NA

Sample

Comments/problems on sectors and regions selected in the sample	On sectors: no On regions: no
Comments on the response rate	NA
Comments on the sample design	N/A

Fieldwork

Date of fieldwork	November 2012 – March 2013
Country	Belarus
Number of completed interviews	360
Problems found during fieldwork	Business surveys in Belarus have always been accompanied by difficulties, caused by the fear of businessmen and directors of commercial enterprises to provide financial-economic information about their enterprises. The trade and construction sectors were especially problematic. These are the very sectors where the controlling bodies reveal the largest number of violations. For instance, in accordance with the information provided by the press-center of the Inspection of the Ministry on Taxes and Levies for Minsk city, the taxation services of Minsk city have revealed more than 140 enterprises that used illegal schemes for minimisation of taxation duties during the I-st quarter of 2013. The following business sectors used the elicited illegal schemes: trade (72 enterprises from 618 controlled or 11.7%) and construction (14 from 121 checked, or 11.6%).
Other observations	No

Questionnaires

Problems for the understanding of questions (write question number)	Comments during pilot were reported and in the mainstage, some respondents did not understand the hypothetical situations in VIN1.
Problems found in the navigability of questionnaires (for example, skip patterns)	No special problems encountered
Comments on questionnaire length	The respondents were advised in advance that the interview would take about one hour to complete. If the interview took much longer than one hour, the respondents were dissatisfied.
Suggestions or other comments on the questionnaires	The questionnaire is difficult to work with in PAPI interviews because the question numbering is not chronological.

Quality control

Fieldwork monitoring	The first 3-5 interviews of each interviewer were checked (the details of the firm were verified, the length of the interview, the quality of the data)
Data checking procedures	In the completed interviews major figures of financial reporting were checked, as well as the main characteristics of the enterprise, observation of filters and skips in the questionnaire, answers for open-ended questions. Also the quality of filling in the entire questionnaire was checked. Quality control calls to the enterprises were used to check and verify the data, we also used alternative sources: publications of financial data for example. In the nine interviewes with high refusal rate, regional supervisors collected additional information during the second visit with founders and owners of these enterprises.
Number of respondents selected for back-checking	40 completed interviews were back-checked (11%). In addition, we back-checked 15 respondents who refused to participate in the survey; 3 ineligible enterprises
Selection procedures	Random selection in each region
Who carried out back-checks?	2 specially trained interviewer who did not conduct the main interviews
Mode of contact	Telephone
Number of completed interviews back-checked	See above
Number of non-responses back-checked	See above
Results of alternative method of contacting non-respondents	NA
Description of what was covered inthe back-checks	Verified the company's name, legal information, details of the main product/service, date the firm was registered, mode of interview, use of showcards and length of interview
Number of completed interviews that were rejected and why	None

Database

Data entry program chosen	SPSS
Comments on the data entry program	None
Comments on the data cleaning	In the case of missing data (to financial questions) when the interviewers tried to get the necessary information, they were faced with categorical denials.

Country situation

General aspects of economic, political or social situation of the country that could affect the results of the survey	The situation in the Belarusian economy is rather complicated. Directive № 4, signed by the President A. Lukashenko on December 31, 2010 is directed at liberalisation of the Belarusian economy, but it does not work on a full scale, which causes distrust from the representatives of private business asked to provide their perspectives of development of market economy in Belarus. During the last months of 2012 several branches of economy were

	nationalised (confectionary industry, woodworking etc.). A number of successful enterprises came under state control in Belarus, before the state share used to be minimal in these enterprises ("Keramin", "Pinskdrev", "Kommunarka", "Spartak" and others). And the President of the country fired the directors of these enterprises. There are plans to introduce changes in the Belarusian legislation, and these changes will make it possible for the state to interfere in the activities of private companies, created in the course of privatisation. Such a situation in the country cannot contribute to a normal reaction of directors of enterprises to our offer to take part in the survey. In the existing situation a suggestion of participating in an international study encourages neither director's pride, nor their wish to represent the country, to present information about it. Rather we should note their closeness and fear of punishment. Frequently directors of enterprises link interviewing with a check that has just finished or is anticipated soon, and they report that checks result in high financial penalities, disproportional to the violations revealed. The existing situation can also explain the refusals to render financial data about the activities of the enterprise in the course of the interview. Only large enterprises (JSC) offered open access to the financial results of their activities. And medium and small enterprises preferred not to provide their financial information. In the course of the fieldwork there were cases of interrupted interviews, when the respondent definitely and directly refused to provide the requested information and refused to continue the interview very harshly, promising to inform the KGB, the police, the President's Administration and other bodies about the interviewer. In January 2013 President's Order of 23.10.2012 № 488 came into force, this order permits the creation of a registry of commercial organisations with high risk of commiting financial violations.
Relevant country events that occurred during fieldwork	In the course of the survey there were no elections, political or economic crises. During the survey there were uncomfortable periods for business studies: Christmas (Catholic and Orthodox) and the New Year. The end of the survey (March) coincided with the period when the enterprises submit their annual financial reports to the taxation offices
Other aspects	N/A

A.5   Bosnia and Herzegovina

A.5.1. Sampling structure and implementation

Bosnia and Herzegovina is divided into two entities, the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Republika Srpska. In addition, there is the Brcko District in the north of the country, which was created in 2000 out of land from both entities. It officially belongs to both, but is governed by neither, and functions under a decentralized system of local government. Sample frames were obtained from the official agencies, AFIP (Agencija za financijske, informaticke I posrednicke usluge) Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and APIF (Agencija za posrednicke, informaticke i finansijske usluge) Republika Srpska for the two entities. The AFIP and APIF frames were merged to form the first frame. That frame was sent to the TNS statistical team in London to select the establishments for interview. The second frame, supplied by the World Bank/EBRD, consisted of enterprises interviewed in BEEPS IV. The World Bank and EBRD required that the attempts should be made to re-interview establishments responding to the BEEPS IV survey where they were within the selected geographical regions and met eligibility criteria. That sample is referred to as the Panel.

The quality of the frame was assessed at the onset of the project. The frame proved to be useful though it showed positive rates of non-eligibility, repetition, non-existent units, etc. These problems are typical of establishment surveys, but given the impact these inaccuracies may have on the results, adjustments were needed when computing the appropriate weights for individual observations. The percentage of

confirmed non-eligible units as a proportion of the total number of contacts to complete the survey was 15.0% (189 out of 1257 establishments).

Regions covered: Sarajevo, Bosna, Herzegovina, Republika Srpska, Distrikt Brcko. Table below shows the grouping of official regions into these four regions.

Regions (official)	Grouping used for stratification purposes in BEEPS V
Bihac region	
Tuzla region	Bosna region
Srednja Bosna region	
Hercegovina region	Hercegovina region (Herzegovina-Neretva, West Herzegovina)
Sarajevo region	Sarajevo region
Sjever Republika Srpska	Republika Srpska
Istok Republika Srpska	
Distrikt Brcko	Distrikt Brcko

Fresh sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Bosna	5-19	123	96	139	358
	20-99	79	56	41	176
	100+	29	6	2	37
	Total	**231**	**158**	**182**	**571**
Distrikt Brcko	5-19	90	198	207	495
	20-99	11	5	7	23
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**101**	**203**	**214**	**518**
Hercegovina	5-19	47	60	42	149
	20-99	34	23	8	65
	100+	14	1	0	15
	Total	**95**	**84**	**50**	**229**
Republika Srpska	5-19	111	101	151	363
	20-99	61	53	38	152
	100+	23	14	8	45
	Total	**195**	**168**	**197**	**560**
Sarajevo	5-19	36	72	69	177
	20-99	22	38	14	74
	100+	8	12	0	20
	Total	**66**	**121**	**83**	**270**
Grand Total		**688**	**734**	**726**	**2148**

Source: Agencija za finansijske, informaticke I posrednicke usluge d.d. (AFIP – Federation of BiH, Distrikt Brcko) and Agencija za posrednicke, informaticke I finansijske usluge (APIF – Republika Srpska).

Panel sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Bosna	5-19	12	18	14	44
	20-99	5	11	10	26
	100+	7	1	10	18
	Total	**24**	**30**	**34**	**88**
Distrikt Brcko	5-19	0	0	0	0
	20-99	0	0	0	0
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Hercegovina	5-19	7	3	6	16
	20-99	2	0	4	6
	100+	1	0	0	1
	Total	**10**	**3**	**10**	**23**
Republika Srpska	5-19	21	13	14	48
	20-99	17	12	16	45
	100+	10	0	10	20
	Total	**48**	**25**	**40**	**113**
Sarajevo	5-19	6	6	21	33
	20-99	2	5	10	17
	100+	4	5	12	21
	Total	**12**	**16**	**43**	**71**
Grand Total		**94**	**74**	**127**	**295**

Source: BEEPS IV.

Original sample design

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Bosna	5-19	22	18	25	65
	20-99	14	8	8	30
	100+	6	4	2	12
	Total	**42**	**30**	**35**	**107**
Distrikt Brcko	5-19	8	19	17	44
	20-99	2	2	1	5
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**10**	**21**	**18**	**49**
Hercegovina	5-19	9	10	8	27
	20-99	4	5	2	11
	100+	2	1	0	3
	Total	**15**	**16**	**10**	**41**
Republika Srpska	5-19	22	16	24	62
	20-99	13	9	9	31
	100+	5	4	3	12
	Total	**40**	**29**	**36**	**105**
Sarajevo	5-19	7	13	15	35
	20-99	4	7	4	15
	100+	2	4	2	8
	Total	**13**	**24**	**21**	**58**
Grand Total		**120**	**120**	**120**	**360**

A.5.2. Status codes

	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Complete interviews **(Total)**	360	245	115
Incomplete interviews	0	0	0
Elegible in process	0	0	0
Refusals	0	0	0
Out of target	189	166	23
Impossible to contact	425	376	49
Ineligible - coop.	0	0	0
Refusal to the Screener	283	225	58
Total	1257	1012	245

	ELIGIBLES			
Eligible	1.Elegible establishment (Correct name and address)	360	245	115
	2. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the new firm/establishment bought the original firm/establishment)	0	0	0
	3. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the firm/establishment changed its name)	0	0	0
	4. Elegible establishment (Wrong address - the firm/establishmen has changed address and the address could be found)	0	0	0
	16. Panel firm - now less than five employees	0	0	0
Ineligible	5. The establishment has less than 5 permanent full time employees	109	109	0
	6. The firm discontinued businesses	71	50	21
	7. Not a business: private household	1	1	0
	8. Ineligible activity: education, agriculture, finances, governments…	8	6	2
Unobtainable	91. No reply *(after having called in different days of the week and in different business hours)*	262	221	41
	92. Line out of order	23	21	2
	93. No tone	81	79	2
	94. Phone number does not exist	39	38	1
	10. Answering machine	0	0	0
	11. Fax line - data line	0	0	0
	12. Wrong address/ moved away and could not get the new references	20	17	3
	13. Refuses to answer the screener	283	225	58
	14. In process *(the establishment is being called/ is being contacted - previous to ask the screener)*	0	0	0
	151. Out of target - outside the covered regions, firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	152. Out of target - firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	153. Impossible to find	0	0	0
	Total	1257	1012	245

A.5.3. Survey and item non-response

The number of completed interviews per contacted establishment was 0.29. This number is the result of two factors: explicit refusals to participate in the survey, as reflected by the rate of rejection (which includes rejections of the screener and the main survey) and the quality of the sample frame, as represented by the presence of ineligible units. The number of rejections per contact was 0.23.

A.5.4. Local agency team involved in the study and its comments on the implementation

Local agency team involved in the survey

Local agency	Name: Ipsos Puls Country: Bosnia and Herzegovina Membership of international organisation: - Activities since: 2000 - Puls, 2010 – Ipsos
Name of Project Manager	Julijan Komšić
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Fieldwork manager: Džana Talić Data entry: Fuad Rahić
Enumerators involved	Enumerators: 54 Recruiters: 54
Other staff involved	Fieldwork Coordinators:10 Editing: 2 Data Entry: 10 Data Processing: 3

Sampling frame

Characteristic of sample frame used	Database of all comapnies that sent balance sheets to state agencies AFIP and APIF (2011).
Source	AFIP and APIF
Year of publication	2011
Comments on the quality of the sample frame	Sample frame was satisfactory.
Year and organisation that conducted the last economic census	N/A
Other sources for companies statistics	-

Sample

Comments/problems on sectors and regions selected in the sample	The biggest problems were in the region of Brcko District, where most of the companies are part of the big Chinese market, without phone numbers and exact addresses. A lot of these are small shop-stalls registered as companies, but that do not operate anymore. Also, where they did exist, a lot of the number of employees did not match the sample information.
Comments on the response rate	The response rate was monitored. It was satisfactory for a business survey with senior management and a long questionnaire.
Comments on the sample design	N/A

Fieldwork

Date of fieldwork	November 2012 – October 2013
Country	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Number of completed interviews	360
Problems found during fieldwork	Reasons for refusal of respondents: lack of time, do not wish to participate in the study. Difficult to get to speak to the director.
Other observations	-

Questionnaires

Problems for the understanding of questions (write question number)	There were no problems with understanding the questions.
Problems found in the navigability of questionnaires (for example, skip patterns)	There were no problems with the navigability of questionnaires.
Comments on questionnaire length	Negative comments from respondents and interviewers on the length of the

	questionnaire and quantity of information required.
Suggestions or other comments on the questionnaires	Shorten the length of the questionnaire.

Quality control

Fieldwork monitoring	The surveys were back-checked. One interviewer was removed because they were conducting the main questionnaire over the phone. Region Brcko District had poorly completed surveys solely because the companies are mostly small Chinese shops, and it was difficult to get any information. Additional control interviewers were employed to carry out checks and follow-ups.
Data checking procedures	As soon as the first interviews were completed, all the checks were done in order to ensure there were no data entry/ routing errors. Later on, we specially developed syntax for checking routing errors, assumption inconsistencies, and for detecting refusals share on certain questions. The syntax was applied at various stages of data collection, to ensure the quality of data. In that way, if any inconsistency seemed to have occurred, it could be promptly checked with the respondent.
Number of respondents selected for back-checking	60
Selection procedures	Randomly selected
Who carried out back-checks?	Telephone control team
Mode of contact	Telephone
Number of completed interviews back-checked	60
Number of non-responses back-checked	0
Results of alternative method of contacting non-respondents	-
Description of what was covered inthe back-checks	Questions asked in back checks: Number of employees The exact name of the company The main activity of the company Innovations Date firm registered
Number of completed interviews that were rejected and why	NA

Database

Data entry program chosen	SM-S (INTERNALLY DEVELOPED DATA ENTRY PROGRAM)
Comments on the data entry program	No comments
Comments on the data cleaning	There were no major issues during data cleaning, since data entry program was strictly defined. In rare cases some data needed to be checked by calling respondents once again.

Country situation

General aspects of economic, political or social situation of the country that could affect the results of the survey	Due the fact that Bosnian government did not change the Constitution (with regard to minority rights) path to EU accession has stopped (financial and all other support). Level of corruption is still high and has not changed within last few years.
Relevant country events that occurred during fieldwork	Fieldwork lasted 11 months so almost all yearly events occured during this period (tax year, local elections).
Other aspects	There are not any other aspects.

A.6   Bulgaria

A.6.1. Sampling structure and implementation

Two sampling frames were used. The first was supplied by the World Bank and EBRD and consisted of enterprises interviewed in BEEPS IV. The World Bank and EBRD required that attempts should be made to re-interview establishments responding to the BEEPS IV survey where they were within the selected geographical regions and met eligibility criteria. That sample is referred to as the Panel. The second sample frame used for the survey in Bulgaria was purchased from APIS. The frame contained a full list of establishments with more than five employees in the target sectors of the survey. This was from the latest available version published in 2012.

The quality of the frame was assessed at the onset of the project. The frame proved to be useful though it showed positive rates of non-eligibility, repetition, non-existent units, etc. These problems are typical of establishment surveys, but given the impact these inaccuracies may have on the results, adjustments were needed when computing the appropriate weights for individual observations. The percentage of confirmed non-eligible units as a proportion of the total number of contacts to complete the survey was 11.1% (119 out of 1073 establishments).

Regional stratification was defined in six regions. These regions are Severozapaden, Severen Tsentralen, Severoiztochen, Yugozapaden, Yuzhen Tsentralen and Yugoiztochen (NUTS-2). Not all sub-regions within these regions were covered.

Regions (official NUTS-2 regions)	Grouping used for stratification purposes in BEEPS V
Severozapaden	Severozapaden (Vidin, *Montana*, Vratsa, *Pleven*, Lovech)
Severen Tsentralen	Severen tsentralen (Veliko Tarnovo, Gabrovo, Ruse, Razgrad, Silistra)
Severoiztochen	Severoiztochen (*Varna*, Dobrich, Shumen, Targovishte)
Yugoiztochen	Yugoiztochen (*Burgas*, Sliven, Yambol, Stara Zagora)
Yugozapaden	Yugozapaden (*Sofia (stolitsa)*, *Sofia*, *Blagoevgrad*, Pernik, Kyustendil)
Yuzhen Tsentralen	Yuzhen Tsentralen (*Plovdiv*, *Haskovo*, Pazardzhik, Smolyan, Kardzhali)

Fresh sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Severen tsentralen	5-19	84	84	48	216
	20-99	46	24	24	94
	100+	24	2	24	50
	Total	**154**	**110**	**96**	**360**
Severoiztochen	5-19	71	94	116	281
	20-99	47	35	23	105
	100+	22	10	23	55
	Total	**140**	**139**	**162**	**441**
Severozapaden	5-19	71	84	22	177
	20-99	47	24	23	94
	100+	23	2	14	39
	Total	**141**	**110**	**59**	**310**
Yugoistochen	5-19	72	92	120	284
	20-99	48	23	23	94
	100+	24	4	24	52
	Total	**144**	**119**	**167**	**430**
Yugozapaden	5-19	138	261	288	687

		Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
	20-99	93	58	88	239
	100+	35	22	19	76
	Total	**266**	**341**	**395**	**1002**
Yuzhen Tsentralen	5-19	119	127	100	346
	20-99	56	31	19	106
	100+	34	11	22	67
	Total	**209**	**169**	**141**	**519**
Grand Total		**1054**	**988**	**1020**	**3062**

Source: APIS 2012.

Panel sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Severen tsentralen	5-19	1			1
	20-99	3			3
	100+				
	Total	**4**			**4**
Severoiztochen	5-19	1	4	9	14
	20-99	1	2	4	7
	100+	3		3	6
	Total	**5**	**6**	**16**	**27**
Severozapaden	5-19	2	1	5	11
	20-99	3		1	4
	100+	2			2
	Total	**7**	**4**	**6**	**17**
Yugoistochen	5-19	2	9	4	15
	20-99		2	2	4
	100+				
	Total	**2**	**11**	**6**	**19**
Yugozapaden	5-19	11	9	26	46
	20-99	5	2	13	20
	100+	3	1	11	15
	Total	**19**	**12**	**50**	**81**
Yuzhen Tsentralen	5-19	8	15	21	44
	20-99	8	7	10	25
	100+	6		3	9
	Total	**22**	**22**	**34**	**78**
Grand Total		**59**	**55**	**112**	**226**

Source: BEEPS IV.

Original sample design

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Severen tsentralen	5-19	7	7	4	18
	20-99	4	2	2	8
	100+	2	1	2	5
	Total	**13**	**10**	**8**	**31**
Severoiztochen	5-19	6	8	10	24
	20-99	4	3	2	9
	100+	2	2	2	6
	Total	**12**	**13**	**14**	**39**
Severozapaden	5-19	6	7	2	15
	20-99	4	2	2	8
	100+	2	1	2	5
	Total	**12**	**10**	**6**	**28**
Yugoistochen	5-19	6	8	10	24
	20-99	4	2	2	8
	100+	2	2	2	6
	Total	**12**	**12**	**14**	**38**
Yugozapaden	5-19	12	22	25	59
	20-99	8	5	8	21
	100+	3	2	2	7
	Total	**23**	**29**	**35**	**87**
Yuzhen Tsentralen	5-19	10	11	9	30
	20-99	5	3	2	10
	100+	3	2	2	7
	Total	**18**	**16**	**13**	**47**
Grand Total		**90**	**90**	**90**	**270**

A.6.2. Status codes

	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Complete interviews **(Total)**	293	223	70
Incomplete interviews	1	1	0
Elegible in process	0	0	0
Refusals	59	49	10
Out of target	119	103	16
Impossible to contact	242	199	43
Ineligible - coop.	0	0	0
Refusal to the Screener	359	323	36
Total	1073	898	175

	ELIGIBLES			
Eligible	1.Elegible establishment (Correct name and address)	346	269	77
	2. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the new firm/establishment bought the original firm/establishment)	1	1	0
	3. Eligible establishment (Different name but same address - the firm/establishment changed its name)	0	0	0
	4. Eligible establishment (Wrong address - the firm/establishmen has changed address and the address could be found)	6	3	3
	16. Panel firm - now less than five employees	0	0	0
Ineligible	5. The establishment has less than 5 permanent full time employees	28	28	0
	6. The firm discontinued businesses	70	54	16
	7. Not a business: private household	2	2	0
	8. Ineligible activity: education, agriculture, finances, governments…	19	19	0
Unobtainable	91. No reply *(after having called in different days of the week and in different business hours)*	86	74	12
	92. Line out of order	0	0	0
	93. No tone	1	0	1
		67	50	17
	10. Answering machine	7	2	5
	11. Fax line - data line	0	0	0
	12. Wrong address/ moved away and could not get the new references	81	73	8
	13. Refuses to answer the screener	359	323	36
	14. In process *(the establishment is being called/ is being contacted - previous to ask the screener)*	6	4	2
	151. Out of target - outside the covered regions, firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	152. Out of target - firm moved abroad	0	0	0
		0	0	0
	Total	1079	902	177

A.6.3. Survey and item non-response

The number of completed interviews per contacted establishment was 0.27. This number is the result of two factors: explicit refusals to participate in the survey, as reflected by the rate of rejection (which includes rejections of the screener and the main survey) and the quality of the sample frame, as represented by the presence of ineligible units. The number of rejections per contact was 0.39.

A.6.4. Local agency team involved in the study and its comments on the implementation

Local agency team involved in the survey

Local agency	Name: Ipsos Country: Bulgaria Membership of international organisation: ESOMAR Activities since: 2001
Name of Project Manager	Magdalena Petkova
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Research Director: Iva Dimova Field Manager: Milena Petrova
Enumerators involved	Enumerators who only conducted the screener: 3 Interviewers who only conducted interviews: 34 Interviewers who conducted screener and interviews:18
Other staff involved	Fieldwork Coordinators: 17 Editing:3 Data Entry: 6 Data Processing: 2

Sampling frame

Characteristic of sample frame used	
Source	APIS Bulgaria Ltd (a private company that provides legal information on companies in Bulgaria. Their data base uses the national trade register)
Year of publication	2012
Comments on the quality of the sample frame	NA
Year and organisation that conducted the last economic census	NA
Other sources for companies statistics	NA

Sample

Comments/problems on sectors and regions selected in the sample	No comment
Comments on the response rate	There were 328 refusals during screening and 60 refusals during interviewing. The repsondents were uncertain and prejudiced towards the survey because of the following reaons; poor financial results for businesses due to the global economic crisis, the policy of the governing party and the unstable political situation in the country.
Comments on the sample design	No comment

Fieldwork

Date of fieldwork	November 2012 - October 2013
Country	Bulgaria
Number of completed interviews	293
Problems found during fieldwork	Poor financial results for the business in the last financial year, explained by the impact of the global economic crisis and the policy of the governing party. The unstable political situation in the country as a whole, along with anti-government protests in the begining of 2013, followed by the resignation of the government and new general elections the main factors that led to the unwillingness and cautiousness to participate in the survey.
Other observations	NA

Questionnaires

Problems for the understanding of questions (write question number)	• D.1a1: Many respondents found if difficult to determine the company's main product/activity e.g. wholesale and retail trade because they thought many areas were integral parts to their business. • VIN 1: Respondents found it difficult to understand the point of the question and to assess hypothetical sitatutions.
Problems found in the navigability of questionnaires (for example, skip patterns)	No comment.
Comments on questionnaire length	The length of the interview was the reason some respondents refused to participate.
Suggestions or other comments on the questionnaires	No comment.

Quality control

Fieldwork monitoring	Regional supervisors were responsible for teams of interviewers. Supervisors assigned work to the interviewers and gave instructions on appointments to be made and interviews to be conducted. They also sent weekly reports updating us on the respondent's contact status. It was the supervisor's responsibility to check and provide additional information about cases where there was a significant number of non-contacts/ invalid phone number or addresses, or when the refusal/ postponement rate in the region was high. In regions where there was a high refusal/non-contact rate, responsibility for contacting respondents was moved to the main office. A call centre was established at the main office. The call centre staff were rotated to maximise the response rate of respondents from the areas with high refusal/postponement rates. Additional training that focused on techniques for approaching a company's top level management and on how to convince them to participate in the survey was also conducted. In the case of respondents with a non-contact outcome interviewers were instructed to conduct a minimum of 10 calls at different business hours and on different days. Where respondents contact details (address & telephone number) were incorrect we searched for the correct details using the internet and additional databases.
Data checking procedures	Regional supervisors checked interviews to ensure that percentage of refusals at certain questions was not too high and that the sampling region and main activity had been coded correctly. The data from the questionnaires was double-checked at the office. Where there was an inconsistency in the data, the respondent was back-checked by phone. When it was not possible to contact respondents by phone, supervisors conducted face-to-face back checks.
Number of respondents selected for back-checking	120
Selection procedures	Randomly selected, with inconsistencies in the data being recorded in the data.
Who carried out back-checks?	We trained a team of CATI interviewers to work on the project in our main office.They conducted the back checks. When it was impossible to contact respondents, the back checks were made face-to-face by the regional supervisors.
Mode of contact	Telephone
Number of completed interviews back-checked	120
Number of non-responses back-checked	2
Results of alternative method of contacting non-respondents	n/a
Description of what was covered	Verifing company name, main activity and number of employees.

inthe back-checks	Year of registration. Checked length of interview and how many respondents participated in the survey. Specific issues related to the inaccuracy of information recorded in interviews.
Number of completed interviews that were rejected and why	4 in total Three interviews were rejected because of the high level of non-response. When respondents were re-contacted for back checking they refused to answer. After back checking one interview was removed because it was discovered that the repsondent did not meet the criteria. The company only had 4 employees and was not a panel company.

Database

Data entry program chosen	SM-S (internally developed data entry program)
Comments on the data entry program	n/a
Comments on the data cleaning	n/a

Country situation

General aspects of economic, political or social situation of the country that could affect the results of the survey	The political crisis in the country; government resignation, protests & general elections.
Relevant country events that occurred during fieldwork	Christmas and Easter holidays, National Holidays, End of the tax year, General elections
Other aspects	NA

A.7   Croatia

A.7.1. Sampling structure and implementation

Two sampling frames were used. The first was supplied by the World Bank and EBRD and consisted of enterprises interviewed in BEEPS IV. The World Bank and EBRD required that attempts should be made to re-interview establishments responding to the BEEPS IV survey where they were within the selected geographical regions and met eligibility criteria. That sample is referred to as the Panel. The source of the second sample frame was the FINA database.

The quality of the frame was assessed at the onset of the project. The frame proved to be useful though it showed positive rates of non-eligibility, repetition, non-existent units, etc. These problems are typical of establishment surveys, but given the impact these inaccuracies may have on the results, adjustments were needed when computing the appropriate weights for individual observations. The percentage of confirmed non-eligible units as a proportion of the total number of contacts to complete the survey was 7.9% (135 out of 1710 establishments).

Regional stratification was defined in 3 regions. These regions are Northwest Croatia, Central and Eastern Croatia, Adriatic Croatia.

Counties (official NUTS-3 regions)	Grouping used for stratification purposes in BEEPS V
Grad Zagreb	Northwest Croatia
Zagrebacka	
Krapinsko-zagorska	
Varazdinska	
Koprivnicko-krizevacka	
Medimurska	
Bjelovarsko-bilogorska	Central and Eastern (Pannonian) Croatia
Viroviticko-podravska	
Pozesko-slavonska	
Brodsko-posavska	
Osjecko-baranjska	
Vukovarsko-srijemska	
Karlovacka	
Sisacko-moslavacka	
Primorsko-goranska	Adriatic Croatia
Licko-senjska	
Istarska	
Zadarska	
Sibeninsko-kninska	
Splitsko-dalmatinska	
Dubrovacko-neretvanska	

Fresh sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
North-West Croatia	5-19	207	278	235	720
	20-99	110	112	141	363
	+100	45	53	11	109
	Total	**362**	**443**	**387**	**1192**
Central Croatia	5-19	122	156	117	395
	20-99	63	59	27	149
	+100	35	12	7	54
	Total	**220**	**227**	**151**	**598**
Adriatic Croatia	5-19	148	245	217	610
	20-99	83	77	104	264
	+100	40	21	14	75
	Total	**271**	**343**	**335**	**949**
Grand Total		**853**	**1013**	**873**	**2739**

Source: FINA (2011).

Panel sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
North-West Croatia	5-19	6	4	11	21
	20-99	7	2	3	12
	+100	15	2	7	24
	Total	**28**	**8**	**21**	**57**
Central Croatia	5-19	4	3	6	13
	20-99	3	0	3	6
	+100	1	1	2	4
	Total	**8**	**4**	**11**	**23**
Adriatic Croatia	5-19	8	4	11	23
	20-99	1	2	4	7
	+100	2	3	7	12
	Total	**11**	**9**	**22**	**42**
Grand Total		**47**	**21**	**54**	**122**

Source: BEEPS IV.

Original sample design

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
North-West Croatia	5-19	23	18	23	64
	20-99	11	8	14	33
	+100	5	7	2	14
	Total	**39**	**33**	**39**	**111**
Central Croatia	5-19	11	12	15	38
	20-99	8	7	2	17
	+100	4	6	1	11
	Total	**23**	**25**	**18**	**66**
Adriatic Croatia	5-19	16	18	22	56
	20-99	8	8	8	24
	+100	4	6	3	13
	Total	**28**	**32**	**33**	**93**
Grand Total		**90**	**90**	**90**	**270**

A.7.2. Status codes

	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Complete interviews **(Total)**	360	323	37
Incomplete interviews	0	0	0
Elegible in process	0	0	0
Refusals	139	125	14
Out of target	135	128	7
Impossible to contact	349	340	9
Ineligible - coop.	0	0	0
Refusal to the Screener	727	679	48
Total	1710	1595	115

	ELIGIBLES			
Eligible	1.Elegible establishment (Correct name and address)	491	443	48
	2. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the new firm/establishment bought the original firm/establishment)	1	1	0
	3. Eligible establishment (Different name but same address - the firm/establishment changed its name)	1	1	0
	4. Eligible establishment (Wrong address - the firm/establishmen has changed address and the address could be found)	6	3	3
	16. Panel firm - now less than five employees	0	0	0
Ineligible	5. The establishment has less than 5 permanent full time employees	54	54	0
	6. The firm discontinued businesses	57	51	6
	7. Not a business: private household	0	0	0
	8. Ineligible activity: education, agriculture, finances, governments…	24	23	1
Unobtainable	91. No reply *(after having called in different days of the week and in different business hours)*	291	283	8
	92. Line out of order	0	0	0
	93. No tone	0	0	0
	94. Phone number does not exist	0	0	0
	10. Answering machine	0	0	0
	11. Fax line - data line	0	0	0
	12. Wrong address/ moved away and could not get the new references	58	57	1
	13. Refuses to answer the screener	727	679	48
	14. In process *(the establishment is being called/ is being contacted - previous to ask the screener)*	3	3	0
	151. Out of target - outside the covered regions, firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	152. Out of target - firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	153. Impossible to find	0	0	0
	Total	1713	1598	115

A.7.3. Survey and item non-response

The number of completed interviews per contacted establishment was 0.21. This number is the result of two factors: explicit refusals to participate in the survey, as reflected by the rate of rejection (which includes rejections of the screener and the main survey) and the quality of the sample frame, as represented by the presence of ineligible units. The number of rejections per contact was 0.51.

A.7.4. Local agency team involved in the study and its comments on the implementation

Local agency team involved in the survey

Local agency	Name: Ipsos Puls d.o.o. Country: Croatia Membership of international organisation: ESOMAR, Gallup International Association Activities since: 1993
Name of Project Manager	Srđan Dumičić Director
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Mirna Cvitan – Senior Research Executive Petra Žilić – Fieldwork Manager Marija Senjanjin – Senior Research Executive
Enumerators involved	Enumerators: 43 Recruiters: 24
Other staff involved	Fieldwork Coordinators: 5 Editing:6 Data Processing: 1

Sampling frame

Characteristic of sample frame used	All enterprises that submitted their financial report for year 2011
Source	Financial agency (FINA) base of enterprises
Year of publication	2012
Comments on the quality of the sample frame	This is the best base that exists in Croatia as "Financial agency" is an institution to which all active companies in Croatia are obliged to submit their financial reports.
Year and organisation that conducted the last economic census	There is no such census in Croatia

Sample

Comments/problems on sectors and regions selected in the sample	No comment.
Comments on the response rate	Response rate was good for a business survey, especially of this length.
Comments on the sample design	There was no problem.

Fieldwork

Date of fieldwork	February 2013 – October 2013
Country	Croatia
Number of completed interviews	360
Problems found during fieldwork	Respondents weren't always willing to give answers to some of the hard data questions, especially important questions in the productivity section. Fieldwork was conducted during the holiday period and at the end of the year when companies have a lot of work which contributed to the high refusal rate.
Other observations	None

Questionnaires

Problems for the understanding of questions (write question number)	There were no problems with understanding questions.
Problems found in the navigability of questionnaires (for example, skip patterns)	There were no problems with understanding questions.
Comments on questionnaire length	Lots of the respondents complained about length of interview even though

	they were informed at recruitment stage.
Suggestions or other comments on the questionnaires	None.

Quality control

Fieldwork monitoring	Experienced interviewers were used to conduct this survey so major problems were experienced. However, all interviewers were strictly monitored. The screening process was mostly completed centrally from the Split office, which meant that it could be closely controlled by the fieldwork manager. There were no problems experienced with this process. The screeners were also completed centrally so again there were no issues. The questionnaire responses were coded in CAPI so there was little room for interviewers to make mistakes. As interviewers were able to skip sections (in case they have to administer it with another respondent) there were a few cases where some of the sections weren't completed. In these cases the interviewer returned to field to collect the missing data. There were also a couple of cases where some of the question responses were missing. These were completed by telephone with the respondent.
Data checking procedures	The same CAPI program was used in another three countries in the region. As soon as the first interviews were completed all of the checks were done to ensure that there were no scripting/routing errors. To continue to ensure the quality of the data special syntaxes were developed for checking routing errors, assumption inconsistencies and for detecting a high percentage of refusals on certain questions. These checks were applied at various stages throughout the data collection period. This meant that inconsistencies could be promptly checked with the respondent.
Number of respondents selected for back-checking	140
Selection procedures	Randomly selected
Who carried out back-checks?	We have a team who are responsible for quality control. Fieldwork supervisors also conduct quality control.
Mode of contact	Telephone
Number of completed interviews back-checked	140
Number of non-responses back-checked	0
Results of alternative method of contacting non-respondents	Non-respondents were contacted face-to-face and then by post.
Description of what was covered inthe back-checks	Questions asked in back checks - Verify Company name Name of respondent and position Topic of survey Interview conducted using a laptop Check length of interview
Number of completed interviews that were rejected and why	No interviews were rejected.

Database

Data entry program chosen	SM-S (internally developed data entry program) - in this case used for CAPI
Comments on the data entry program	Everything was working properly
Comments on the data cleaning	There were no major issues during data cleaning since the CAPI program was strictly defined. In rare cases some data that seemed odd needed to be back-checked by calling respondents once again.

Country situation

General aspects of economic, political or social situation of the country that could affect the results of the survey	The economic situation in country is very poor, GDP has not grown for more than five years, lots of companies are closing or they are in process of bankruptcy. Fiscal policy has tightened and new rules for VAT were implemented, especially for smaller companies.
Relevant country events that occurred during fieldwork	Three holidays in June, summer vacation and long weekend in October. There were local elections held in May but this did not influence fieldwork significantly
Other aspects	None

A.8 Czech Republic

A.8.1. Sampling structure and implementation

The first sampling frame was supplied by the World Bank and EBRD and consisted of enterprises interviewed in BEEPS IV. The World Bank and EBRD required that attempts should be made to re-interview establishments responding to the BEEPS IV survey where they were within the selected geographical regions and met eligibility criteria. That sample is referred to as the Panel. The second frame for the Czech Republic was an official database known as Albertina data (Creditinfo Czech Republic), which is obtained from the complete Business Register [RES] of the Czech Statistical Office.

The quality of the frame was assessed at the onset of the project. The frame proved to be useful though it showed positive rates of non-eligibility, repetition, non-existent units, etc. These problems are typical of establishment surveys, but given the impact these inaccuracies may have on the results, adjustments were needed when computing the appropriate weights for individual observations. The percentage of confirmed non-eligible units as a proportion of the total number of contacts to complete the survey was 1.6% (44 out of 2775 establishments).

Regional stratification was defined in eight regions. These regions are Praha, Stredni Cechy, Jihozapad, Severozapad, Severovychod, Jihovychod, Stredni Morava, and Moravskoslezsko (NUTS-2).

Fresh sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Jihovychod	5-19	206	178	270	654
	20-99	176	119	86	381
	100+	84	25	59	168
	Total	**466**	**322**	**415**	**1203**
Jihozapad	5-19	150	149	180	479
	20-99	119	85	29	233
	100+	57	0	29	86
	Total	**326**	**234**	**238**	**798**
Moravskoslezsko	5-19	119	148	179	446
	20-99	89	86	59	234
	100+	59	16	29	104
	Total	**267**	**250**	**267**	**784**
Praha	5-19	147	239	508	894
	20-99	87	148	178	413
	100+	89	88	58	235
	Total	**323**	**475**	**744**	**1542**
Severovychod	5-19	210	178	238	626
	20-99	147	90	29	266
	100+	85	12	30	127
	Total	**442**	**280**	**297**	**1019**
Severozapad	5-19	89	179	150	418
	20-99	59	59	60	178
	100+	58	7	0	65
	Total	**206**	**245**	**210**	**661**
Stredni Cechy	5-19	150	147	208	505
	20-99	87	85	28	200
	100+	59	19	29	107
	Total	**296**	**251**	**265**	**812**
Stredni Morava	5-19	148	180	175	503
	20-99	113	76	57	246
	100+	57	12	0	69
	Total	**318**	**268**	**232**	**818**
Grand Total		**2644**	**2325**	**2668**	**7637**

Source: Albertina data (Creditinfo Czech Republic) 2012.

Panel sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Jihovychod	5-19	0	1	0	1
	20-99	1	0	1	2
	100+	3	0	1	4
	Total	**4**	**1**	**2**	**7**
Jihozapad	5-19	4	2	0	6
	20-99	4	1	4	9
	100+	6	0	1	7
	Total	**14**	**3**	**5**	**22**
Moravskoslezsko	5-19	1	2	1	4
	20-99	1	2	1	4
	100+	1	0	1	2
	Total	**3**	**4**	**3**	**10**
Praha	5-19	3	1	2	6
	20-99	3	2	2	7
	100+	1	2	2	5
	Total	**7**	**5**	**6**	**18**
Severovychod	5-19	0	2	2	4
	20-99	3	0	1	4
	100+	5	0	0	5
	Total	**8**	**2**	**3**	**13**
Severozapad	5-19	1	1	0	2
	20-99	1	1	0	2
	100+	2	0	0	2
	Total	**4**	**2**	**0**	**6**
Stredni Cechy	5-19	0	3	2	5
	20-99	3	0	2	5
	100+	1	0	1	2
	Total	**4**	**3**	**5**	**12**
Stredni Morava	5-19	2	0	5	7
	20-99	7	0	3	10
	100+	3	0	0	3
	Total	**12**	**0**	**8**	**20**
Grand Total		**56**	**20**	**32**	**108**

Source: BEEPS IV.

Original sample design

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Jihovychod	5-19	7	6	9	22
	20-99	6	4	3	13
	100+	3	3	2	8
	Total	**16**	**13**	**14**	**43**
Jihozapad	5-19	5	5	6	16
	20-99	4	4	1	9
	100+	2	0	1	3
	Total	**11**	**9**	**8**	**28**
Moravskoslezsko	5-19	4	5	6	15
	20-99	3	3	2	8
	100+	2	2	1	5
	Total	**9**	**10**	**9**	**28**
Praha	5-19	5	8	17	30
	20-99	3	5	6	14
	100+	3	3	2	8
	Total	**11**	**16**	**25**	**52**
Severovychod	5-19	7	6	8	21
	20-99	5	3	1	9
	100+	3	2	1	6
	Total	**15**	**11**	**10**	**36**
Severozapad	5-19	3	6	5	14
	20-99	2	3	2	7
	100+	2	1	0	3
	Total	**7**	**10**	**7**	**24**
Stredni Cechy	5-19	5	5	7	17
	20-99	3	3	1	7
	100+	2	2	1	5
	Total	**10**	**10**	**9**	**29**
Stredni Morava	5-19	5	6	6	17
	20-99	4	3	2	9
	100+	2	2	0	4
	Total	**11**	**11**	**8**	**30**
Grand Total		**90**	**90**	**90**	**270**

A.8.2. Status codes

	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Complete interviews **(Total)**	254	236	18
Incomplete interviews	0	0	0
Elegible in process	12	11	1
Refusals	76	65	11
Out of target	44	40	4
Impossible to contact	797	792	5
Ineligible - coop.	1	1	0
Refusal to the Screener	1591	1536	55
Total	2775	2681	94

	ELIGIBLES	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Eligible	1.Elegible establishment (Correct name and address)	310	283	27
	2. Eligible establishment (Different name but same address - the new firm/establishment bought the original firm/establishment)	0	0	0
	3. Eligible establishment (Different name but same address - the firm/establishment changed its name)	5	5	0
	4. Eligible establishment (Wrong address - the firm/establishmen has changed address and the address could be found)	27	24	3
	16. Panel firm - now less than five employees	0	0	0
Ineligible	5. The establishment has less than 5 permanent full time employees	3	3	0
	6. The firm discontinued businesses	21	18	3
	7. Not a business: private household	14	14	0
	8. Ineligible activity: education, agriculture, finances, governments…	6	5	1
Unobtainable	91. No reply *(after having called in different days of the week and in different business hours)*	582	577	5
	92. Line out of order	1	1	0
	93. No tone	1	1	0
	94. Phone number does not exist	190	190	0
	10. Answering machine	13	13	0
	11. Fax line - data line	8	8	0
	12. Wrong address/ moved away and could not get the new references	2	2	0
	13. Refuses to answer the screener	1591	1536	55
	14. In process *(the establishment is being called/ is being contacted - previous to ask the screener)*	9	9	0
	151. Out of target - outside the covered regions, firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	152. Out of target - firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	153. Impossible to find	1	1	0
	Total	2784	2690	94

A.8.3. Survey and item non-response

The number of completed interviews per contacted establishment was 0.09. This number is the result of two factors: explicit refusals to participate in the survey, as reflected by the rate of rejection (which includes rejections of the screener and the main survey) and the quality of the sampling frame, as represented by the presence of ineligible units. The number of rejections per contact was 0.60.

A.8.4. Local agency team involved in the study and its comments on the implementation

Local agency team involved in the survey

Local agency 1	Ipsos Tambor SRO
Name of Project Manager	Barbora Kasparkova
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Marketa Zampachova (Account Manager), Arnost Janecek (Account Director)
Enumerators involved	26
Other staff involved	-

Local agency 2	Median SRO
Name of Project Manager	Jan Farkac
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Erika Kovaricova (Head of Research), Eva Ksirova (Fieldwork manager)
Enumerators involved	46
Other staff involved	-

Local agency 3	DataCollect SRO
Name of Project Manager	Pavel Alince (Project Director and Manager)
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Lucie Luhanová (Data Specialist)
Enumerators involved	33
Other staff involved	-

Sampling frame

Characteristic of sample frame used	Database ALBERTINA (http://www.albertina.cz/czech/afm/p_poparo.html)
Source	Albertina - Creditinfo Czech Republic. Drawn from the complete RES (database of the Czech Statistical Office)
Year of publication	2012
Comments on the quality of the sample frame	Many of the telephone numbers were out of date in the sample frame provided
Year and organisation that conducted the last economic census	2011, Czech Statistical Office

Sample

Comments/problems on sectors and regions selected in the sample	No region or sector-specific issues
Comments on the response rate	The response rate was pretty low, top managers of companies rarely have time to complete an interview this long and extensive without any incentive at all
Comments on the sample design	No design-specific issues – however the complex sampling design lengthened fieldwork considerably

Fieldwork

Date of fieldwork	January 2013 – April 2014
Country	Czech Republic
Number of completed interviews	254 (Tambor - 22, DataCollect - 53, Median - 179)
Problems found during fieldwork	We had a high refusal rate mostly because of how long and complicated the interview was with no incentive for respondents, who were top managers with little time to spare. This made recruitment very hard and was also the reason for refusals after the screener had been completed.
	A general distrust of surveys and institutions in the Czech republic was also a

	factor.
	Slow completion led to two further agencies being commissioned to complete fieldwork, and training times, etc. lengthened fieldwork too, and ultimately the target of 270 interviews was not achieved.
Other observations	

Questionnaires

Problems for the understanding of questions (write question number)	-
Problems found in the navigability of questionnaires (for example, skip patterns)	-
Comments on questionnaire length	The interview length was too long for top managers to fill in with no incentive offered in return
Suggestions or other comments on the questionnaires	We would recomend making it as short as possible next time, which would increase the response rate significantly.

Quality control

Fieldwork monitoring	Fieldwork was monitored constantly due to the requirement of sending weekly progress reports. Recruitment was constantly monitored by our CATI supervisors. Interviewers were called when they were unable to complete recruited interviews within two weeks, and some contacts were reassigned to other interviewers. We chose the most experienced interviewers so there were no major issues.
Data checking procedures	The data was thoroughly checked after first few interviews, to ensure the quality of the CAPI script. We then uploaded part of the data to be sure we correctly transformed it to the datamap.
Number of respondents selected for back-checking	A few respondents terminated the interview before it was done and refused to by recontacted, so those interviews had to be discarded and marked as refusals.
Selection procedures	random selection
Who carried out back-checks?	The backchecks are done by mail sent out by our fieldwork manager
Mode of contact	E-mail
Number of completed interviews back-checked	60
Number of non-responses back-checked	Recruitment was over CATI, so monitored by our CATI supervisors. We back-checked 5 out of 35 respondents who refused after the screener
Results of alternative method of contacting non-respondents	Respondents who refused were contacted by e-mail too
Description of what was covered inthe back-checks	Respondent's memory of the interview; the gender of interviewer; the day time and duration of interview; rnode of interview; topics of the survey.
Number of completed interviews that were rejected and why	A few respondents terminated the interviewing before it was complete and refused to by recontacted, so those interviews had to be discarded and marked as refusals.

Database

Data entry program chosen	CAPI – no data entry program required
Comments on the data entry program	-
Comments on the data cleaning	Checks were primarily conducted using syntax provided and the datamap

Country situation

General aspects of economic, political or social situation of the country that could affect the results of the survey	The country is still dealing with the economic crisis. There were elections in September 2013 which could have influenced the results.

Relevant country events that occurred during fieldwork	The fieldwork period stretched over most public holidays in the country, and a General Election, during an economic downturn, and was also interrupted by the most serious floods for decades, which paralysed the country.
Other aspects	

A.9   Estonia

A.9.1. Sampling structure and implementation

The first sampling frame was supplied by the World Bank and EBRD and consisted of enterprises interviewed in BEEPS IV. The World Bank and EBRD required that attempts should be made to re-interview establishments responding to the BEEPS IV survey where they were within the selected geographical regions and met eligibility criteria. That sample is referred to as the Panel. The source of the second sample frame was taken from information held by the Ministry of Justice-run Centre of Registers and Information Systems (RIK). The initial sample was drawn in August 2012.

The quality of the frame was assessed at the onset of the project. The frame proved to be useful though it showed positive rates of non-eligibility, repetition, non-existent units, etc. These problems are typical of establishment surveys, but given the impact these inaccuracies may have on the results, adjustments were needed when computing the appropriate weights for individual observations. The percentage of confirmed non-eligible units as a proportion of the total number of contacts to complete the survey was 5.4% (37 out of 679 establishments).

Regional stratification was defined in 5 regions. These regions are Põhja-Eesti, Lääne-Eesti, Kesk-Eesti, Kirde-Eesti, and Lõuna-Eesti (NUTS-3).

Counties	Grouping used for stratification purposes in BEEPS V
Tallinn	Põhja-Eesti
Harjumaa	
Hiiumaa	Lääne-Eesti
Läänemaa	
Pärnumaa	
Saaremaa	
Järvamaa	Kesk-Eesti
Lääne-Virumaa	
Raplamaa	
Ida-Virumaa	Kirde-Eesti
Jõgevamaa	Lõuna-Eesti
Põlvamaa	
Tartumaa	
Valgamaa	
Viljandimaa	
Võrumaa	

Fresh sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Kesk-Eesti	5-19	11	21	12	44
	20-99	10	9	4	23
	100+	11	6	0	17
	Total	**32**	**36**	**16**	**84**
Kirde-Eesti	5-19	9	36	11	56
	20-99	9	2	2	13
	100+	5	0	3	8
	Total	**23**	**38**	**16**	**77**
Lääne-Eesti	5-19	11	34	36	81
	20-99	9	18	4	31
	100+	12	3	0	15
	Total	**32**	**55**	**40**	**127**
Lõuna-Eesti	5-19	33	53	52	138
	20-99	17	9	7	33
	100+	6	7	4	17
	Total	**56**	**69**	**63**	**188**
Põhja-Eesti	5-19	93	118	87	298
	20-99	42	20	54	116
	100+	8	8	9	25
	Total	**143**	**146**	**150**	**439**
Grand Total		**286**	**344**	**285**	**915**

Source: Centre of Registers and Information Systems (RIK).

Panel sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Kesk-Eesti	5-19	4	3	5	12
	20-99	2	1	3	6
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**6**	**4**	**8**	**18**
Kirde-Eesti	5-19	3	4	4	11
	20-99	3	1	1	5
	100+	1	0	0	1
	Total	**7**	**5**	**5**	**17**
Lääne-Eesti	5-19	3	4	6	13
	20-99	5	1	2	8
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**8**	**5**	**8**	**21**
Lõuna-Eesti	5-19	4	4	7	15
	20-99	3	3	2	8
	100+	3	2	2	7
	Total	**10**	**9**	**11**	**30**
Põhja-Eesti	5-19	5	5	6	16
	20-99	4	4	10	18
	100+	4	4	3	11
	Total	**13**	**13**	**19**	**45**
Grand Total		**44**	**36**	**51**	**131**

Source: BEEPS IV.

Original sample design

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Kesk-Eesti	5-19	5	8	6	19
	20-99	4	3	2	9
	100+	2	2	0	4
	Total	11	13	7	32
Kirde-Eesti	5-19	4	11	4	19
	20-99	3	1	1	5
	100+	2	0	1	3
	Total	9	12	6	27
Lääne-Eesti	5-19	5	13	10	28
	20-99	4	4	2	10
	100+	2	1	0	3
	Total	11	18	12	41
Lõuna-Eesti	5-19	11	17	19	47
	20-99	6	4	3	13
	100+	3	2	2	7
	Total	20	23	24	67
Põhja-Eesti	5-19	20	26	22	68
	20-99	11	4	10	25
	100+	4	3	3	10
	Total	35	33	35	103
Grand Total		86	90	85	270

A.9.2. Status codes

	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Complete interviews **(Total)**	273	200	73
Incomplete interviews	0	0	0
Elegible in process	0	0	0
Refusals	31	27	4
Out of target	37	18	19
Impossible to contact	4	4	0
Ineligible - coop.	2	2	0
Refusal to the Screener	332	297	35
Total	679	548	131

	ELIGIBLES			
Eligible	1.Elegible establishment (Correct name and address)	295	222	73
Eligible	2. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the new firm/establishment bought the original firm/establishment)	1	0	1
Eligible	3. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the firm/establishment changed its name)	0	0	0
Eligible	4. Elegible establishment (Wrong address - the firm/establishmen has changed address and the address could be found)	8	5	3
Eligible	16. Panel firm - now less than five employees	0	0	0
Ineligible	5. The establishment has less than 5 permanent full time employees	7	7	0
Ineligible	6. The firm discontinued businesses	28	9	19
Ineligible	7. Not a business: private household	0	0	0
Ineligible	8. Ineligible activity: education, agriculture, finances, governments...	2	2	0
Unobtainable	91. No reply *(after having called in different days of the week and in different business hours)*	3	3	0
Unobtainable	92. Line out of order	0	0	0
Unobtainable	93. No tone	0	0	0
Unobtainable	94. Phone number does not exist	0	0	0
Unobtainable	10. Answering machine	0	0	0
Unobtainable	11. Fax line - data line	0	0	0
Unobtainable	12. Wrong address/ moved away and could not get the new references	1	1	0
	13. Refuses to answer the screener	332	297	35
	14. In process *(the establishment is being called/ is being contacted - previous to ask the screener)*	0	0	0
	151. Out of target - outside the covered regions, firm moved abroad	2	2	0
	152. Out of target - firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	153. Impossible to find	0	0	0
	Total	679	548	131

A.9.3. Survey and item non-response

The number of completed interviews per contacted establishment was 0.40. This number is the result of two factors: explicit refusals to participate in the survey, as reflected by the rate of rejection (which includes rejections of the screener and the main survey) and the quality of the sampling frame, as represented by the presence of ineligible units. The number of rejections per contact was 0.53.

A.9.4. Local agency team involved in the study and its comments on the implementation

Local agency team involved in the survey

Local agency	Name: Turu-Uuringute AS Country: Estonia Membership of international organisation: ESOMAR Activities since: 1994
Name of Project Manager	Iivi Riivits-Arkonsuo
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Tõnis Stamberg (Director), Marina Karpištšenko (Field Manager)
Enumerators involved	38
Other staff involved	Reijo Pohl (Data Processing)

Sampling frame

Characteristic of sample frame used	Business register
Source	Centre of Registers and Information Systems (RIK)
Year of publication	2012
Comments on the quality of the sample frame	The frame contained a number of legal addresses, meaning that firms operated in different regions of the country to their registered address
Year and organisation that conducted the last economic census	NA

Sample

Comments/problems on sectors and regions selected in the sample	No problems with the sample
Comments on the response rate	Good considering the length of the survey
Comments on the sample design	None
Other comments	None

Fieldwork

Date of fieldwork	February 2013 – July 2013
Country	Estonia
Number of completed interviews	273
Problems found during fieldwork	No significant problems
Other observations	NA

Questionnaires

Problems for the understanding of questions (write question number)	None
Problems found in the navigability of questionnaires (for example, skip patterns)	None
Comments on questionnaire length	Interview was too long, making it hard to implement and increasing refusals significantly
Suggestions or other comments on the questionnaires	Very precise data was required at a number of points, and there was particular hostility and notably higher refusals to finance-related questions

Quality control

Fieldwork monitoring	Weekly monitoring of interviewer progress
Data checking procedures	Every questionnaire was reviewed by field managers
Number of respondents selected for back-checking	70
Selection procedures	Purposive

Who carried out back-checks?	Field managers
Mode of contact	Telephone
Number of completed interviews back-checked	70
Number of non-responses back-checked	0
Results of alternative method of contacting non-respondents	NA
Description of what was covered in the back-checks	Clarifications and recall
Number of completed interviews that were rejected and why	Two interviews were rejected due to excessively high levels of non-response and refusal to clarify at the recontact stage

Database

Data entry program chosen	Proprietary data entry software
Comments on the data entry program	NA
Comments on the data cleaning	NA

Country situation

General aspects of economic, political or social situation of the country that could affect the results of the survey	NA
Relevant country events that occurred during fieldwork	The survey ran during the annual company reporting period as well as a number of public holidays. The end of fieldwork overlapped with the summer holiday period, making progress at that time slower too.
Other aspects	NA

A.10 FYR Macedonia

A.10.1. Sampling structure and implementation

The first sampling frame was supplied by the World Bank and EBRD and consisted of enterprises interviewed in BEEPS IV. The World Bank and EBRD required that attempts should be made to re-interview establishments responding to the BEEPS IV survey where they were within the selected geographical regions and met eligibility criteria. That sample is referred to as the Panel. The source of the second sample frame was provided by the EBRD based on a business register from Orbis database.

The quality of the frame was assessed at the onset of the project. The frame proved to be useful though it showed positive rates of non-eligibility, repetition, non-existent units, etc. These problems are typical of establishment surveys, but given the impact these inaccuracies may have on the results, adjustments were needed when computing the appropriate weights for individual observations. The percentage of confirmed non-eligible units as a proportion of the total number of contacts to complete the survey was 31.3% (205 out of 655 establishments).

Regional stratification was defined in 4 regions. These regions are Eastern, North-West & West, Skopje, and South. Table below shows the municipalities included in each of these four regions.

NUTS-3 statistical regions	Grouping used for stratification purposes in BEEPS V
Skopje	Skopje
Eastern	
North Eastern	Eastern Macedonia
South Eastern	
South Western	North-West & West Macedonia
Poloski	
Vardarski	South Macedonia
Pelagoniski	

Fresh sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Eastern Macedonia	5-19	51	78	57	186
	20-99	36	12	9	57
	100+	7	0	3	10
	Total	**94**	**90**	**69**	**253**
North-West & West Macedonia	5-19	41	89	72	202
	20-99	13	13	11	37
	100+	0	3	3	6
	Total	**54**	**105**	**86**	**245**
Skopje	5-19	90	91	85	266
	20-99	34	17	47	98
	100+	15	3	13	31
	Total	**139**	**111**	**143**	**393**
South Macedonia	5-19	38	68	44	150
	20-99	21	9	11	41
	100+	9	0	3	12
	Total	**68**	**77**	**58**	**203**
Grand Total		**355**	**383**	**356**	**1094**

Source: Bureau van Dijk's Orbis database.

Panel sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Eastern Macedonia	5-19	12	12	10	34
	20-99	16	9	11	36
	100+	9	3	0	12
	Total	**37**	**24**	**21**	**82**
North-West & West Macedonia	5-19	5	3	7	15
	20-99	11	10	9	30
	100+	0	3	0	3
	Total	**16**	**16**	**16**	**48**
Skopje	5-19	15	29	13	57
	20-99	6	27	18	51
	100+	11	15	3	29
	Total	**32**	**71**	**34**	**137**
South Macedonia	5-19	7	10	7	24
	20-99	8	8	8	24
	100+	9	3	0	12
	Total	**24**	**21**	**15**	**60**
Grand Total		**109**	**132**	**86**	**327**

Source: BEEPS IV.

Original sample design

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Eastern Macedonia	5-19	14	26	23	63
	20-99	5	5	4	14
	100+	0	1	1	2
	Total	**19**	**32**	**28**	**79**
North-West & West Macedonia	5-19	30	30	30	90
	20-99	11	6	14	31
	100+	5	1	5	11
	Total	**46**	**37**	**49**	**132**
Skopje	5-19	17	23	19	59
	20-99	12	4	3	19
	100+	3	0	1	4
	Total	**32**	**27**	**23**	**82**
South Macedonia	5-19	13	21	15	49
	20-99	7	3	4	14
	100+	3	0	1	4
	Total	**23**	**24**	**20**	**67**
Grand Total		**120**	**120**	**120**	**360**

A.10.2.   Status codes

	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Complete interviews **(Total)**	360	181	179
Incomplete interviews	0	0	0
Elegible in process	0	0	0
Refusals	16	10	6
Out of target	205	178	27
Impossible to contact	17	13	4
Ineligible - coop.	5	2	3
Refusal to the Screener	52	37	15
Total	655	421	234

	ELIGIBLES	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Eligible	1.Elegible establishment (Correct name and address)	357	186	171
	2. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the new firm/establishment bought the original firm/establishment)	2	2	0
	3. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the firm/establishment changed its name)	0	0	0
	4. Elegible establishment (Wrong address - the firm/establishmen has changed address and the address could be found)	10	3	7
	16. Panel firm - now less than five employees	7	0	7
Ineligible	5. The establishment has less than 5 permanent full time employees	86	86	0
	6. The firm discontinued businesses	106	86	20
	7. Not a business: private household	0	0	0
	8. Ineligible activity: education, agriculture, finances, governments…	13	6	7
Unobtainable	91. No reply *(after having called in different days of the week and in different business hours)*	2	2	0
	92. Line out of order	0	0	0
	93. No tone	0	0	0
	94. Phone number does not exist	0	0	0
	10. Answering machine	0	0	0
	11. Fax line - data line	0	0	0
	12. Wrong address/ moved away and could not get the new references	15	11	4
	13. Refuses to answer the screener	52	37	15
	14. In process *(the establishment is being called/ is being contacted - previous to ask the screener)*	0	0	0
	151. Out of target - outside the covered regions, firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	152. Out of target - firm moved abroad	5	2	3
	153. Impossible to find	0	0	0
	Total	655	421	234

A.10.3.   Survey and item non-response

The number of completed interviews per contacted establishment was 0.55. This number is the result of two factors: explicit refusals to participate in the survey, as reflected by the rate of rejection (which includes rejections of the screener and the main survey) and the quality of the sampling frame, as represented by the presence of ineligible units. The number of rejections per contact was 0.10.

A.10.4.   Local agency team involved in the study and its comments on the implementation

Local agency team involved in the survey

Local agency	Name: Ipsos Country: FYR Macedonia
Name of Project Manager	Tania Ivanova
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Nevena Taskovska, Project Administrator
Enumerators involved	Enumerators who only conducted the screener: 0 Interviewers who only conducted interviews: 12 Interviewers who conducted screener and interviews: 8
Other staff involved	Fieldwork Coordinators: 5 Data Editing: 2 Data Entry: 5 Data Processing: 1

Sampling frame

Characteristic of sample frame used	The sample frame contained most of the stratification variables: name of the establishment, contact details, region, city and municipality, ISIC codes, employee number.
Source	Orbis
Year of publication	Updated 2011
Comments on the quality of the sample frame	The sample frame included inconsistencies and outdated information, as well as missing information, for example, number of employees. It also included errors on company regions (companies from the south, placed in north and vice verca), which was immediately reported before the start and handled with extra care during the whole fieldwork period. There were also issues with the sector, primarily due to the fact that companies register for many different activities and select one as a main one but in actual reality deal with a completely diffferent primary activity.
Year and organisation that conducted the last economic census	NA
Other sources for companies information	The Central Registry in Macedonia is the only official place to get information on company statistics, but they no longer provide it for business surveys.

Sample

Comments/problems on sectors and regions selected in the sample	There were some areas in specific regions that have a higher rate of closed businesses and also more hostile respondents.
Comments on the response rate	The response rate was constantly checked and monitored. However, due to the length of the interview, hectic schedules, and frequently because of respondent's beliefs that foreign agencies have interfered locally for a long period without improving the business environment, some respondents refused despite all interviewer's attempts to convince them to take part.
Comments on the sample design	None

Fieldwork

Date of fieldwork	December 2012 – May 2013
Country	FYR Macedonia
Number of completed interviews	360
Problems found during fieldwork	The end of the tax year resulted in slower progress in 2013, as did the one week long New Year and Christmas holidays (many companies were not operational in the first 2 weeks of January 2013). Political interference in the business sector also increased the refusal rate and willingness to provide

	answers to questions on financial data and attitudinal questions. Disbelief in foreign institutions present in the country throughout the transition and turbulent times also influenced the whole process.
Other observations	None

Questionnaires

Problems for the understanding of questions (write question number)	M1 – Because this was a PAPI survey in Macedonia, some respondents claimed there were obstacles at M1 that were not reported earlier in the questionnaires. H6 – A lot of respondents found it difficult to understand what research and development was, despite the explanations provided. K9 – Revolving bank credits caused problems. They are not officially loans but respondents reported having opened accounts/loans.
Problems found in the navigability of questionnaires (for example, skip patterns)	No problems here
Comments on questionnaire length	The interview length was a serious challenge, particularly during recruitment
Suggestions or other comments on the questionnaires	None

Quality control

Fieldwork monitoring	All interviewers who seemed to have issues with higher number of calls and no call backs, or those who reported refusals and unreachable companies were followed closely and replaced if it was discovered that the interviewer's personal approach was not suitable for this survey. Two of them were immediately replaced at the start, and during the course of the fieldwork additional 2 interviewers were removed due to much lower performance. The screening process was closely monitored and it was performed from the Ipsos office only (except in a few occasions were we had very successful field visits and recruitments so there was no need to use the office staff for a successful scheduling of an interview). Each call/visit, or e-mailing was registered in separate excel sheets that were later submitted to the fieldwork supervisor and manager for further processing and decisions. Interview length was very much dependant on the respondent and type of company but due to close follow up by the office staff there were no spaces for ill-performance. Breakdowns by regions were followed closely in order to have a clear picture per region and due to sample issues in this respect (there were mixed up regions in the initial sample that were not corrected, so we needed to pay additional attention to this.). Regarding the number of calls, in many cases there were more than 10 calls (including visits, re-visits due to respondent's schedule and busy lifestyle, and e-mails), and it was always checked by the responsible person for recruiting if recruiters were following an appropriate pattern for calling the respondents - times of day/week, as well as moderation in order not to annoy the potential respondent with too many calls.
Data checking procedures	First 10% of interviews were checked upon completion and interviewers were briefed after each initial interview if any issues occurred, as well as checked further till it was clear that they had understood everything correctly and were not making any mistakes in routing or coding the answers. Additional checks were done on throughout fieldwork so that if any missing data occurred the respondent could be recontacted quickly. Also, all sensitive questions were checked for refusal rates (in case of any 'systematic' patterns among individual interviewers, it was checked on the field if it was a respondent or interviewer issue).
Number of respondents selected for back-checking	100

Selection procedures	Randomly selected per interviewer and region
Who carried out back-checks?	Fieldwork team members who did not conduct BEEPS interviews were involved under guidance by an experienced recruiter and supervisor
Mode of contact	Telephone and face to face
Number of completed interviews back-checked	91
Number of non-responses back-checked	9
Results of alternative method of contacting non-respondents	
Description of what was covered inthe back-checks	Verification of general company details (No of employees, sector, address and similar) Main product check Length of interview Random questions selected from the questionnaire (employee number in 2009, issues with electricity/water and similar)
Number of completed interviews that were rejected and why	There were 3 interviews rejected due to very poor quality of data and no willingness to provide the requested answers further in the process despite all efforts and calls/visits.

Database

Data entry program chosen	PERTS
Comments on the data entry program	None
Comments on the data cleaning	Data cleaning was done following the validation reports sent by Ipsos MORI.

Country situation

General aspects of economic, political or social situation of the country that could affect the results of the survey	There is a lot of political interference in the country, and this means businesses are increasingly reluctant to take part in surveys
Relevant country events that occurred during fieldwork	Christmas, New Year and Easter holidays, and other national holiday, as well the elections, and the end of tax year meant that the fieldwork progress slowed at particular periods. One change in policy occurred immediately before the start of the project - State Statistical Office changed its policy and stopped providing B2B statistical data upon external requests (prior changes in privacy regulations were the cause). This seriously influenced the process of sampling and resulted in not getting the actual sample frame from them. Another state sample source was very expensive and therefore the client's source was used in the end.
Other aspects	None

A.11 Georgia

A.11.1.   Sampling structure and implementation

The first sampling frame was supplied by the World Bank and EBRD and consisted of enterprises interviewed in BEEPS IV. The World Bank and EBRD required that attempts should be made to re-interview establishments responding to the BEEPS IV survey where they were within the selected geographical regions and met eligibility criteria. That sample is referred to as the Panel. The second sample frame is based on official data from department of Statistics of Ministry of Economic Development of Georgia 2012.

The quality of the frame was assessed at the onset of the project. The frame proved to be useful though it showed positive rates of non-eligibility, repetition, non-existent units, etc. These problems are typical of establishment surveys, but given the impact these inaccuracies may have on the results, adjustments were needed when computing the appropriate weights for individual observations. The percentage of

confirmed non-eligible units as a proportion of the total number of contacts to complete the survey was 25.8% (339 out of 1316 establishments).

Regional stratification was defined in 6 regions. These regions are Tblisi, Kvemo Kartli, West, Kakheti, Mmtskheta-Mtianeti and Shida Kartli, and the Coastline.

Region (Mkhare)	Districts	Grouping to be used for stratification purposes in BEEPS V
Tbilisi	Tbilisi	Tbilisi
Kvemo Kartli	Bolnisi, Dmanisi, Gardabani, Marneuli, Rustavi, Tetritskaro, Tsalka	Kvemo Kartli
Samtskhe-Javakheti	Adigeni, Akhalkalaki, Akhaltsikhe, Aspindza, Borjomi, Ninotsminda; Not covered in 2008	Imereti & Racha-Lechkhumi and Kvemo Svaneti & Samtskhe-Javakheti (West)
Imereti	Baghdati, Chiatura, Kharagauli, Khoni, Kutaisi, Sachkhere, Samtredia, Terjola, Tkibuli, Tskaltubo, Vani, Zestaponi	
Racha-Lechkhumi and Kvemo Svaneti	Ambrolauri, Lentekhi, Oni, Tsageri; Not covered in 2008	
Kakheti	Akhmeta, Dedoplistskaro, Gurjaani, Kvareli, Lagodekhi, Sagarejo, Sighnagi, Telavi	Kakheti
Mtskheta-Mtianeti	Akhalgori, Dusheti, Kazbegi, Mtskheta, Tianeti	Mtskheta-Mtianeti & Shida Kartli
Shida Kartli	Gori, Java, Kareli, Kaspi, Khashuri, Tskhinvali	
Adjara	Batumi, Keda, Khelvachauri, Khulo, Kobuleti, Shuakhevi; Not covered in 2008	Adjara, Guria and Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti (Coastline)
Guria	Chokhatauri, Lanchkhuti, Ozurgeti; Not covered in 2008	
Samegrelo and Zemo Svaneti	Abasha, Chkorotsku, Khobi, Martvili, Mestia, Poti, Senaki, Tsalenjikha, Zugdidi; Not covered in 2008	

Fresh sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Coastline	5-19	150	285	284	719
	20-99	75	60	90	225
	100+	26	14	29	69
	Total	**251**	**359**	**403**	**1013**
Kakheti	5-19	82	90	54	226
	20-99	29	17	21	67
	100+	10	0	0	10
	Total	**121**	**107**	**75**	**303**
Kvemo Kartli	5-19	84	105	130	319
	20-99	38	31	23	92
	100+	15	6	20	41
	Total	**137**	**142**	**173**	**452**
Mtskheta-Mtianeti & Shida Kartli	5-19	80	104	51	235
	20-99	31	23	32	86
	100+	9	0	6	15
	Total	**120**	**127**	**89**	**336**
Tbilisi	5-19	418	442	391	1251
	20-99	141	119	259	519
	100+	70	56	64	190
	Total	**629**	**617**	**714**	**1960**
West	5-19	141	199	170	510
	20-99	69	43	37	149
	100+	15	10	0	25
	Total	**225**	**252**	**207**	**684**
Grand Total		**1483**	**1604**	**1661**	**4748**

Source: Department of Statistics of Georgia.

Panel sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Coastline	5-19	0	0	1	1
	20-99	0	0	0	0
	100+	0	0	1	1
	Total	**0**	**0**	**2**	**2**
Kakheti	5-19	8	15	6	29
	20-99	6	2	9	17
	100+	6	0	0	6
	Total	**20**	**17**	**15**	**52**
Kvemo Kartli	5-19	6	15	5	26
	20-99	3	0	7	10
	100+	3	0	1	4
	Total	**12**	**15**	**13**	**40**
Mtskheta-Mtianeti & Shida Kartli	5-19	10	16	24	50
	20-99	11	2	13	26
	100+	7	0	9	16
	Total	**28**	**18**	**46**	**92**
Tbilisi	5-19	17	8	14	39
	20-99	9	16	11	36
	100+	5	4	11	20
	Total	**31**	**28**	**36**	**95**
West	5-19	9	11	10	30
	20-99	6	2	8	16
	100+	2	0	0	2
	Total	**17**	**13**	**18**	**48**
Grand Total		**108**	**91**	**130**	**329**

Source: BEEPS IV.

Original sample design

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Coastline	5-19	10	19	19	48
	20-99	5	4	6	15
	100+	4	2	2	8
	Total	**19**	**25**	**27**	**71**
Kakheti	5-19	6	7	4	17
	20-99	4	2	2	8
	100+	3	0	0	3
	Total	**13**	**9**	**6**	**28**
Kvemo Kartli	5-19	6	8	9	23
	20-99	4	3	2	9
	100+	3	2	2	7
	Total	**13**	**13**	**13**	**39**
Mtskheta-Mtianeti & Shida Kartli	5-19	6	8	5	19
	20-99	4	3	3	10
	100+	3	0	1	4
	Total	**13**	**11**	**9**	**33**
Tbilisi	5-19	29	30	27	86
	20-99	10	9	18	37
	100+	5	4	5	14
	Total	**44**	**43**	**50**	**137**
West	5-19	10	14	12	36
	20-99	5	3	3	11
	100+	3	2	0	5
	Total	**18**	**19**	**15**	**52**
Grand Total		**120**	**120**	**120**	**360**

A.11.2. Status codes

	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Complete interviews **(Total)**	360	279	81
Incomplete interviews	0	0	0
Elegible in process	0	0	0
Refusals	10	1	9
Out of target	339	292	47
Impossible to contact	370	292	78
Ineligible - coop.	0	0	0
Refusal to the Screener	237	193	44
Total	1316	1057	259

	ELIGIBLES	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Eligible	1.Elegible establishment (Correct name and address)	368	278	90
	2. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the new firm/establishment bought the original firm/establishment)	0	0	0
	3. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the firm/establishment changed its name)	1	1	0
	4. Elegible establishment (Wrong address - the firm/establishmen has changed address and the address could be found)	1	1	0
	16. Panel firm - now less than five employees	0	0	0
Ineligible	5. The establishment has less than 5 permanent full time employees	159	155	4
	6. The firm discontinued businesses	171	133	38
	7. Not a business: private household	7	4	3
	8. Ineligible activity: education, agriculture, finances, governments...	2	0	2
Unobtainable	91. No reply *(after having called in different days of the week and in different business hours)*	0	0	0
	92. Line out of order	20	13	7
	93. No tone	21	18	3
	94. Phone number does not exist	0	0	0
	10. Answering machine	1	1	0
	11. Fax line - data line	0	0	0
	12. Wrong address/ moved away and could not get the new references	328	260	68
	13. Refuses to answer the screener	237	193	44
	14. In process *(the establishment is being called/ is being contacted - previous to ask the screener)*	0	0	0
	151. Out of target - outside the covered regions, firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	152. Out of target - firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	153. Impossible to find	0	0	0
	Total	1316	1057	259

A.11.3. Survey and item non-response

The number of completed interviews per contacted establishment was 0.27. This number is the result of two factors: explicit refusals to participate in the survey, as reflected by the rate of rejection (which includes rejections of the screener and the main survey) and the quality of the sampling frame, as represented by the presence of ineligible units. The number of rejections per contact was 0.19.

A.11.4. Local agency team involved in the study and its comments on the implementation

Local agency team involved in the survey

Local agency	Name: The Institute for Polling and Marketing Country: Georgia Membership of international organisation: N/A Activities since: 1995
Name of Project Manager	Tamar Nozadze
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Gocha Tskitishvili, Project Director Lali Zaalishvili, Field Manager Mako Mchedlishvili, Person responsible for data management/upload
Enumerators involved	Enumerators: 16 Recruiters: 6
Other staff involved	Fieldwork Coordinators: 10 Editing: 2 Data Entry: 3 Data Processing: 2

Sampling frame

Characteristic of sample frame used	Sample frame (Business register) was provided by National Statistics Office of Georgia, it contained information up to April, 2012.
Source	National Statistics Office of Georgia
Year of publication	2012
Comments on the quality of the sample frame	In general, the names and the activities of the firms matched, but telephone numbers were innacurate, with out of date or missing numbers, which made it harder to contact the respondents. The organisations, which did not operate any more but were not officially liquidated, were still included in the sampling frame.
Year and organisation that conducted the last economic census	N/A
Other sources for companies statistics	-

Sample

Comments/problems on sectors and regions selected in the sample	-
Comments on the response rate	In most cases the reason for refusal was not having enough time. Then it was that the respondent was not interested in participating in research, or that the respondent did not trust the research company.
Comments on the sample design	-
Other comments	-

Fieldwork

Date of fieldwork	December 2012 – May 2013
Country	Georgia
Number of completed interviews	360
Problems found during fieldwork	There were not many problems during the fieldwork except that contact info provided by geostat was not accurate, phone numbers were missing or were incorrect. We than had to look for the company's contact info in other sources, which required time and resources. Main reasons for the refusals were: 1) the respondents did not have time 2) they did not trust the research companies and the result of the researches 3) they were not interested in participating in survey 4) In some cases the company had e.g. manufacturing code in sampling

	frame and after filling the screener it turned out to be retail or core.
Other observations	-

Questionnaires

Problems for the understanding of questions (write question number)	-
Problems found in the navigability of questionnaires (for example, skip patterns)	-
Comments on questionnaire length	-
Suggestions or other comments on the questionnaires	-

Quality control

Fieldwork monitoring	Breakdowns by regions were monitored; selection of the respondents per sampling unit was monitored. Screeners were checked thoroughly to avoid overlapping. Interviewers who were responsible for the recruitment were monitored for high numbers of refusals or non-contacts. Also, the Number of completed interviews per interviewer per day was also monitored. The time gap between interviews was also checked.
Data checking procedures	All questionnaires underwent 100% logical control. In case there were inconsistencies they were improved by contacting the respondent. After data entry data was checked according to the instructions provided by the client. If the questionnaire had a high rate of refusals or don't know responses the questionnares were double-checked by contacting the respondent.
Number of respondents selected for back-checking	120
Selection procedures	Divided into regions and then randomly selected.
Who carried out back-checks?	We used the quality control group, who controlled the quality of the interviews.
Mode of contact	Telephone and face-to-face
Number of completed interviews back-checked	110
Number of non-responses back-checked	10
Results of alternative method of contacting non-respondents	Only telephone or face-to-face back-checks were used.
Description of what was covered inthe back-checks	Questions asked in back checks - Verify Company name Number of employees Date firm registered Checked if the respondents were asked about infrastructure and services Details of main product Checked if the respondents were asked about workforce compostion Checked if the respondents were asked about services connected with customs and tax office Checked if the respondents were asked about bribery Checked if the respondents were asked about banks and loans Checked length of interview Checked if the showcards were given to the respondents
Number of completed interviews that were rejected and why	4 interviews were rejected because 1) high rates of non-responses and 2) violation of interview selection procedure.

Database

Data entry program chosen	SPSS, WebADC
Comments on the data entry	-

program	
Comments on the data cleaning	-

Country situation

General aspects of economic, political or social situation of the country that could affect the results of the survey	Before the fieldwork parliamentary elections took place, and the political situation has totally changed as a result. New ruling party was focussed on improving environment for businesses, attracting new investment, reducing poverty, improving the economic situation etc. As the result, people in general, and our respondents also, were more open and did not hide their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the government.
Relevant country events that occurred during fieldwork	1) September 2012 was very tense and full of negative events (revealed videos with torture of prisoners, evidence of political blackmailing). Georgian society rebelled against the existing regime and legally took away power from the party "National Movement" and elected a new government. After revealing evidence of torture, the President of Georgia and his party lost the confidence and support of society and their rating fell down. 2) On the 1st of October 2012 parliamentary elections were held, which changed existing political balance, as major ruling party lost the elections and the opposition party won. 3) The end of March was deadline for submitting documents for 2012 fiscal year; so many interviews were postponed after that time by request of the respondents. 4) After New year Holidays there were many religious holidays in January, so practically from the end of December until 19th of January it was very hard to conduct the interivews.
Other aspects	-

A.12 Hungary

A.12.1. Sampling structure and implementation

The first sampling frame was supplied by the World Bank and EBRD and consisted of enterprises interviewed in BEEPS IV. The World Bank and EBRD required that attempts should be made to re-interview establishments responding to the BEEPS IV survey where they were within the selected geographical regions and met eligibility criteria. That sample is referred to as the Panel. The second sample frame for Hungary was taken from data held by the Hungarian Central Statistical Office (KSH).

The quality of the frame was assessed at the onset of the project. The frame proved to be useful though it showed positive rates of non-eligibility, repetition, non-existent units, etc. These problems are typical of establishment surveys, but given the impact these inaccuracies may have on the results, adjustments were needed when computing the appropriate weights for individual observations. The percentage of confirmed non-eligible units as a proportion of the total number of contacts to complete the survey was 9.1% (101 out of 1106 establishments).

Regional stratification was defined in three regions. These regions are Central Hungary, West Hungary and East Hungary (NUTS-1).

NUTS-2 regions	Grouping used for stratification purposes in BEEPS V
Central Hungary (Közép-Magyarország)	Budapest Central (Közép-Magyarország)
Central – Transdanubia (Közép-Dunántúl)	West Hungary (Dunántúl)
Western – Transdanubia (Nyugat-Dunántúl)	
Southern – Transdanubia (Dél-Dunántúl)	
Northern Hungary (Észak-Magyarország)	East Hungary (Alföld és Észak)
Northern Great Plain (Észak-Alföld)	
Southern Great Plain (Dél-Alföld)	

Fresh sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Budapest Central (Közép-Magyarország)	5-19	153	215	288	656
	20-99	67	83	61	211
	100+	43	47	15	105
	Total	**263**	**345**	**364**	**972**
East Hungary (Alföld és Észak)	5-19	254	255	288	797
	20-99	120	79	71	270
	100+	63	46	53	162
	Total	**437**	**380**	**412**	**1229**
West Hungary (Dunántúl)	5-19	176	174	170	520
	20-99	90	83	32	205
	100+	52	24	19	95
	Total	**318**	**281**	**221**	**820**
Grand Total		**1018**	**1006**	**997**	**3021**

Source: KSH (Hungarian Central Statistical Office) 2012.

Panel sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Budapest Central (Közép-Magyarország)	5-19	3	1	12	16
	20-99	5	1	11	17
	100+	5	2	9	16
	Total	**13**	**4**	**32**	**49**
East Hungary (Alföld és Észak)	5-19	10	9	12	31
	20-99	12	5	13	30
	100+	9	2	7	18
	Total	**31**	**16**	**32**	**79**
West Hungary (Dunántúl)	5-19	4	6	10	20
	20-99	6	1	4	11
	100+	8	0	5	13
	Total	**18**	**7**	**19**	**44**
Grand Total		**62**	**27**	**83**	**172**

Source: BEEPS IV.

Original sample design

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Budapest Central (Közép-Magyarország)	5-19	13	18	25	56
	20-99	6	7	6	19
	100+	4	5	2	11
	Total	**23**	**30**	**33**	**86**
East Hungary (Alföld és Észak)	5-19	22	22	25	69
	20-99	11	7	7	25
	100+	6	5	5	16
	Total	**39**	**34**	**37**	**110**
West Hungary (Dunántúl)	5-19	15	15	15	45
	20-99	8	7	3	18
	100+	5	4	2	11
	Total	**28**	**26**	**20**	**74**
Grand Total		**90**	**90**	**90**	**270**

A.12.2. Status codes

	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Complete interviews **(Total)**	310	247	63
Incomplete interviews	0	0	0
Elegible in process	36	30	6
Refusals	11	9	2
Out of target	101	93	8
Impossible to contact	324	299	25
Ineligible - coop.	1	1	0
Refusal to the Screener	323	277	46
Total	1106	956	150

	ELIGIBLES			
Eligible	1.Elegible establishment (Correct name and address)	357	286	71
Eligible	2. Eligible establishment (Different name but same address - the new firm/establishment bought the original firm/establishment)	0	0	0
Eligible	3. Eligible establishment (Different name but same address - the firm/establishment changed its name)	0	0	0
Eligible	4. Eligible establishment (Wrong address - the firm/establishmen has changed address and the address could be found)	0	0	0
Eligible	16. Panel firm - now less than five employees	0	0	0
Ineligible	5. The establishment has less than 5 permanent full time employees	26	25	1
Ineligible	6. The firm discontinued businesses	75	68	7
Ineligible	7. Not a business: private household	0	0	0
Ineligible	8. Ineligible activity: education, agriculture, finances, governments…	0	0	0
Unobtainable	91. No reply *(after having called in different days of the week and in different business hours)*	83	70	13
Unobtainable	92. Line out of order	6	5	1
Unobtainable	93. No tone	7	7	0
Unobtainable	94. Phone number does not exist	0	0	0
Unobtainable	10. Answering machine	1	1	0
Unobtainable	11. Fax line - data line	4	4	0
Unobtainable	12. Wrong address/ moved away and could not get the new references	223	212	11
	13. Refuses to answer the screener	323	277	46
	14. In process *(the establishment is being called/ is being contacted - previous to ask the screener)*	74	73	1
	151. Out of target - outside the covered regions, firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	152. Out of target - firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	153. Impossible to find	1	1	0
	Total	1180	1029	151

A.12.3. Survey and item non-response

The number of completed interviews per contacted establishment was 0.28. This number is the result of two factors: explicit refusals to participate in the survey, as reflected by the rate of rejection (which includes rejections of the screener and the main survey) and the quality of the sampling frame, as represented by the presence of ineligible units. The number of rejections per contact was 0.30.

A.12.4. Local agency team involved in the study and its comments on the implementation

Local agency team involved in the survey

Local agency	Ipsos Hungary Zrt.
Name of Project Manager	Diana Aszatrjan
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Tibor Zavecz (Project Director), Klara Horvath (former project manager), Ibolya Beier (Field manager), Aniko Bodi (Data processing)
Enumerators involved	18
Other staff involved	Data entry and editing staff

Sampling frame

Characteristic of sample frame used	Business register
Source	KSH (Hungarian Central Statistical Office)
Year of publication	2012
Comments on the quality of the sample frame	Some outdated information but overall acceptable
Year and organisation that conducted the last economic census	KSH – 2011
Other sources for companies statistics	-

Sample

Comments/problems on sectors and regions selected in the sample	Overall fine, although the impact of the economic crisis was particularly felt in Eastern Hungary, where a lot of businesses had closed
Comments on the response rate	-
Comments on the sample design	-

Fieldwork

Date of fieldwork	February 2013 – July 2013
Country	Hungary
Number of completed interviews	310
Problems found during fieldwork	Incorrect application of sampling methodology led to oversampling of firms, but this was resolved
Other observations	-

Questionnaires

Problems for the understanding of questions (write question number)	None
Problems found in the navigability of questionnaires (for example, skip patterns)	None
Comments on questionnaire length	Respondents noted that it was very long
Suggestions or other comments on the questionnaires	Don't know and refusal should be permissible in more locations

Quality control

Fieldwork monitoring	Fieldwork was monitored throughout; resources were diverted to Eastern Hungary when it became clear that recruitment there would be more difficult
Data checking procedures	Standard procedures, plus use of the datamap to ensure that data fitted the description
Number of respondents selected for back-checking	30

Selection procedures	Ten were randomly selected from each region
Who carried out back-checks?	An independent department in Ipsos Hungary carried out the checks
Mode of contact	Telephone
Number of completed interviews back-checked	15
Number of non-responses back-checked	15
Results of alternative method of contacting non-respondents	N/A
Description of what was covered inthe back-checks	Date of the interview and identity of the interviewer, plus firm information
Number of completed interviews that were rejected and why	0

Database

Data entry program chosen	QDS (Questionnaire Design Studio)
Comments on the data entry program	Proprietory system
Comments on the data cleaning	-

Country situation

General aspects of economic, political or social situation of the country that could affect the results of the survey	The effects of the financial crisis were felt because many firms in the sample had become bankrupt.
Relevant country events that occurred during fieldwork	National holidays – summer holiday period and Christmas (for re-contacts)
Other aspects	-

A.13 Kazakhstan

A.13.1.   Sampling structure and implementation

The first sampling frame was supplied by the World Bank and EBRD and consisted of enterprises interviewed in BEEPS IV. The World Bank and EBRD required that attempts should be made to re-interview establishments responding to the BEEPS IV survey where they were within the selected geographical regions and met eligibility criteria. That sample is referred to as the Panel. The second sample frame for Kazakhstan was a file of establishments obtained from the Agency of Statistics of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

The quality of the frame was assessed at the onset of the project. The frame proved to be useful though it showed positive rates of non-eligibility, repetition, non-existent units, etc. These problems are typical of establishment surveys, but given the impact these inaccuracies may have on the results, adjustments were needed when computing the appropriate weights for individual observations. The percentage of confirmed non-eligible units as a proportion of the total number of contacts to complete the survey was 14.0% (537 out of 3837 establishments).

Regional stratification was defined in five regions. These regions are North, West, East, South, and Central. Table below shows the grouping of oblasts into these five regions.

Regions	Grouping used for stratification purposes in BEEPS V (oblasts in brackets)
Centre	Centre (Karagandinskaya)
East	East (Vostochno-Kazakhstanskaya)
North	North (Astana, Akmolinskaya, Severo-Kazakhstanskaya, Kostanayskaya, Pavlodarskaya)
South	South (Almaty, Kyzylordinskaya, Zhambylskaya, Yuzhno-Kazakhstanskaya, Almatinskaya)
West	West (Mangistauskaya, Atyrauskaya, Aktyubinskaya, Zapadno-Kazakhstanskaya)

Fresh sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Central	5-19	350	222	345	917
	20-99	266	55	76	397
	100+	98	11	23	132
	Total	**714**	**288**	**444**	**1446**
East	5-19	337	294	345	976
	20-99	265	77	74	416
	100+	97	10	20	127
	Total	**699**	**381**	**439**	**1519**
North	5-19	558	772	1066	2396
	20-99	396	300	555	1251
	100+	237	38	47	322
	Total	**1191**	**1110**	**1668**	**3969**
South	5-19	885	1062	1061	3008
	20-99	497	372	691	1560
	100+	284	90	101	475
	Total	**1666**	**1524**	**1853**	**5043**
West	5-19	348	335	687	1370
	20-99	267	98	129	494
	100+	116	18	53	187
	Total	**731**	**451**	**869**	**2051**
Grand Total		**5001**	**3754**	**5273**	**14028**

Source: Agency of Statistics of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2011.

Panel sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Central	5-19	4	4	6	14
	20-99	4	4	5	13
	100+	4	3	4	11
	Total	**12**	**11**	**15**	**38**
East	5-19	14	12	6	32
	20-99	5	8	7	20
	100+	12	3	7	22
	Total	**31**	**23**	**20**	**74**
North	5-19	9	10	14	33
	20-99	9	10	12	31
	100+	4	5	7	16
	Total	**22**	**25**	**33**	**80**
South	5-19	6	18	19	43
	20-99	16	8	11	35
	100+	13	5	7	25
	Total	**35**	**31**	**37**	**103**
West	5-19	6	11	15	32
	20-99	3	2	6	11
	100+	5	2	1	8
	Total	**14**	**15**	**22**	**51**
Grand Total		**114**	**105**	**127**	**346**

Source: BEEPS IV.

Original sample design

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Central	5-19	13	14	13	40
	20-99	10	5	3	18
	100+	7	2	1	10
	Total	30	21	17	68
East	5-19	13	16	13	42
	20-99	10	6	3	19
	100+	8	1	1	10
	Total	31	23	17	71
North	5-19	21	33	40	94
	20-99	15	19	21	55
	100+	9	4	2	15
	Total	45	56	63	164
South	5-19	33	40	40	113
	20-99	19	22	26	67
	100+	11	9	4	24
	Total	63	71	70	204
West	5-19	13	19	26	58
	20-99	10	8	5	23
	100+	8	2	2	12
	Total	31	29	33	93
Grand Total		200	200	200	600

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total

A.13.2. Status codes

	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Complete interviews **(Total)**	600	517	83
Incomplete interviews	0	0	0
Elegible in process	0	0	0
Refusals	144	125	19
Out of target	537	498	39
Impossible to contact	2115	2019	96
Ineligible - coop.	32	31	1
Refusal to the Screener	409	346	63
Total	3837	3536	301

	ELIGIBLES			
Eligible	1.Elegible establishment (Correct name and address)	728	629	99
	2. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the new firm/establishment bought the original firm/establishment)	0	0	0
	3. Eligible establishment (Different name but same address - the firm/establishment changed its name)	8	7	1
	4. Eligible establishment (Wrong address - the firm/establishmen has changed address and the address could be found)	7	5	2
	16. Panel firm - now less than five employees	1	0	1
Ineligible	5. The establishment has less than 5 permanent full time employees	18	17	1
	6. The firm discontinued businesses	436	401	35
	7. Not a business: private household	46	44	2
	8. Ineligible activity: education, agriculture, finances, governments…	37	36	1
Unobtainable	91. No reply *(after having called in different days of the week and in different business hours)*	507	467	40
	92. Line out of order	141	134	7
	93. No tone	59	57	2
	94. Phone number does not exist	298	287	11
	10. Answering machine	34	33	1
	11. Fax line - data line	2	2	0
	12. Wrong address/ moved away and could not get the new references	1074	1039	35
	13. Refuses to answer the screener	409	346	63
	14. In process *(the establishment is being called/ is being contacted - previous to ask the screener)*	1	1	0
	151. Out of target - outside the covered regions, firm moved abroad	29	28	1
	152. Out of target - firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	153. Impossible to find	3	3	0
	Total	3838	3536	302

A.13.3. Survey and item non-response

The number of completed interviews per contacted establishment was 0.16. This number is the result of two factors: explicit refusals to participate in the survey, as reflected by the rate of rejection (which includes rejections of the screener and the main survey) and the quality of the sampling frame, as represented by the presence of ineligible units. The number of rejections per contact was 0.14.

A.13.4. Local agency team involved in the study and its comments on the implementation

Local agency team involved in the survey

Local agency	Name: SIAR Research & Consulting Country: Republic of Kazakhstan Activities since: 1998
Name of Project Manager	Ainoura Sagynbaeva
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Elnura Ibraeva, Field Manager, Data management Gulmira Janibekova: coordinator, Rahat Djamaeva: assistant coordinator, Nurseiit Raimzhanov; assistant coordinator
Enumerators involved	Enumerators: 18 Recruiters:.14
Other staff involved	Fieldwork Coordinators: 11 Editing: 10 Data Entry: 6 Data Processing: 4

Sampling frame

Characteristic of sample frame used	Statistical committee sample of establishments
Source	Statistical committee
Year of publication	2011
Comments on the quality of the sample frame	Many of enterprises were not available (closed or didn't exist). The big obstacle was the lack of contact information.
Year and organisation that conducted the last economic census	Since 2011 the National statistical committee doesn't carry out economic censuses. The registration of the enterprises is carried out every year by the Ministry of Justice. But the information about the registered companies is strictly confidential.
Other sources for companies statistics	

Sample

Comments/problems on sectors and regions selected in the sample	No comments
Comments on the response rate	Long questionnaire and low level of respondent interest meant it was difficult to achieve a high response rate
Comments on the sample design	There were fewer preferences at the beginning of the project, so it took time to receive the new preferences and to move onto the next set of preferences.

Fieldwork

Date of fieldwork	December 2012 – August 2013
Country	Republic of Kazakhstan
Number of completed interviews	600
Problems found during fieldwork	There were not any political and economic reasons for refusal. The main reasons for refusal of respondents were: lack of the time, absence of the director, vacation seasons. Respondents refused to answer the questions connected with finance.
Other observations	No comments

Questionnaires

Problems for the understanding of questions (write question number)	No comment.
Problems found in the navigability	No comments

of questionnaires (for example, skip patterns)	
Comments on questionnaire length	No comments
Suggestions or other comments on the questionnaires	No comments

Quality control

Fieldwork monitoring	There were supervisors in every region assigning work to the interviewers. The recruitment call-center was established in the main office, where the work of the call-center operators was divided according to the different regions of Kazakhstan. Details of interview appointments were then given to the supervisor, who in turn distributed them to interviewers. Thus, we managed to appoint and handle interviews more effectively. Interviewers remained more or less the same throughout fieldwork. If there was no result/no contact made after 10 calls, the team went back and searched the web and other possible sources of information. If the call -center operator was not effective, then they were replaced. Interviewers were able to cope well with their work, they were very experienced and so we did not experience any serious problems.
Data checking procedures	The supervisors in every region controlled and checked the reliability and quality of completed questionnaires. Once this was done, these questionnaires were sent to the main office in Bishkek where they were checked a second time. If some of the data was unclear the appropriate company/respondent was called by phone to clarify the data/responses.
Number of respondents selected for back-checking	60
Selection procedures	Randomly selected
Who carried out back-checks?	The supervisors in the regions conducted the back-checks.
Mode of contact	Telephone
Number of completed interviews back-checked	60
Number of non-responses back-checked	0
Results of alternative method of contacting non-respondents	N/A
Description of what was covered inthe back-checks	Questions asked in back checks - Name of respondent, company name, activity of the company, length of the interview, number of employees.
Number of completed interviews that were rejected and why	Six questionnaires were rejected because no information was recorded in the financial section.

Database

Data entry program chosen	SPSS
Comments on the data entry program	No comments
Comments on the data cleaning	No comments

Country situation

General aspects of economic, political or social situation of the country that could affect the results of the survey	There were not any political and economic reasons for refusal.
Relevant country events that occurred during fieldwork	New year, Christmas, 8 March, Nauryz national holiday (21, 22, 23 of March), 9 may, Independ day of RK (16, 17 December)
Other aspects	No comments

A.14   Kosovo

A.14.1.   Sampling structure and implementation

The first sample frame was supplied by the World Bank and EBRD and consisted of enterprises interviewed in BEEPS IV. The World Bank and EBRD required that attempts should be made to re-interview establishments responding to the BEEPS IV survey where they were within the selected geographical regions and met eligibility criteria. That sample is referred to as the Panel. The second sample frame for Kosovo was a file of establishments obtained from the Kosovo Business Registraton Agency and Serbian Business Registers Agency

The quality of the frame was assessed at the onset of the project. The frame proved to be useful though it showed positive rates of non-eligibility, repetition, non- existent units, etc. These problems are typical of establishment surveys, but given the impact these inaccuracies may have on the results, adjustments were needed when computing the appropriate weights for individual observations. The percentage of confirmed non-eligible units as a proportion of the total number of contacts to complete the survey was 31.9% (211 out of 662 establishments).

Regional stratification was defined in 7 regions. These regions are Dakovica, Gnjilane, Kosovska Mitrovica, Pec, Pristina, Prizren, and Urosevac. Table below lists the municipalities in each region.

Grouping used for stratification purposes in BEEPS V (municipalities in brackets)
Đakovica / Gjakovë (Đakovica/ Gjakovë, Dečani/ Deçan, Orahovac/ Rahovec)
Gnjilane (Gnjilane/ Gjilan, Kosovska Kamenica/ Kamenicë, Vitina/Viti)
Kosovska Mitrovica/Mitrovicë (Mitrovica, Leposavić/ Albanik, Srbica/ Skënderaj, Vučitrn/ Vushtrri, Zubin Potok, Zvečan/ Zveçan)
Peć / Pejë (Peć/ Pejë, Istok/ Burim, Klina/ Klinë)
Priština/Prishtina (Pristina, Glogovac/ Gllogovc, Kosovo Polje/ Fushë Kosovë, Lipljan/Lipjan, Novo Brdo/ Novobërdë, Obilić/Kastriot, Podujevo/ Podujevë)
Prizren (Prizren, Dragaš/Dragash, Suva Reka/ Suharekë, Mališevo/ Malishevë)
Uroševac/Ferizaj (Uroševac, Štimlje/ Shtime, Kačanik/ Kaçanik, Štrpce/ Shtërpcë)

Fresh sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Đakovica / Gjakovë	5-19	20	20	33	73
	20-99	4	0	1	5
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**24**	**20**	**34**	**78**
Gnjilane	5-19	22	14	25	61
	20-99	4	0	3	7
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**26**	**14**	**28**	**68**
Kosovska Mitrovica/Mitrovicë	5-19	16	8	23	47
	20-99	8	0	4	12
	100+	0	0	2	2
	Total	**24**	**8**	**29**	**61**
Peć /Pejë	5-19	16	16	23	55
	20-99	0	0	0	0
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**16**	**16**	**23**	**55**
Priština/Prishtina	5-19	62	59	163	284
	20-99	21	15	40	79
	100+	4	0	6	10
	Total	**87**	**74**	**209**	**370**
Prizren	5-19	25	10	43	78
	20-99	6	3	6	15
	100+	1	0	2	3
	Total	**32**	**13**	**51**	**96**
Uroševac/Ferizaj	5-19	25	7	41	73
	20-99	7	2	8	17
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**32**	**9**	**49**	**90**
Grand Total		**241**	**154**	**423**	**818**

Source: Kosovo Business Registraton Agency and Serbian Business Registers Agency.

Panel sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Đakovica / Gjakovë	5-19	2	0	1	3
	20-99	2	0	1	3
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**4**	**0**	**2**	**6**
Gnjilane	5-19	0	0	1	1
	20-99	0	0	0	0
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**
Kosovska Mitrovica/Mitrovicë	5-19	0	0	1	1
	20-99	0	0	0	0
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**
Peć /Pejë	5-19	4	1	0	1
	20-99	0	0	0	0
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**4**	**1**	**0**	**5**
Priština/Prishtina	5-19	4	2	7	13
	20-99	0	0	6	6
	100+	0	0	1	1
	Total	**4**	**2**	**14**	**20**
Prizren	5-19	1	0	3	4
	20-99	0	0	1	1
	100+	1	0	0	1
	Total	**2**	**0**	**4**	**6**
Uroševac/Ferizaj	5-19	1	0	0	1
	20-99	0	0	0	0
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Grand Total		**15**	**3**	**22**	**40**

Source: BEEPS IV.

Original sample design

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Đakovica / Gjakovë	5-19	9	9	8	26
	20-99	2	0	1	3
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**11**	**9**	**9**	**29**
Gnjilane	5-19	9	5	5	19
	20-99	2	0	1	3
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**11**	**5**	**6**	**22**
Kosovska Mitrovica/Mitrovicë	5-19	7	3	5	15
	20-99	3	0	1	4
	100+	0	0	1	1
	Total	**10**	**3**	**7**	**20**
Peć /Pejë	5-19	8	6	6	20
	20-99	0	0	0	0
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**8**	**6**	**6**	**20**
Priština/Prishtina	5-19	29	19	37	85
	20-99	10	9	11	26
	100+	2	5	3	5
	Total	**41**	**24**	**51**	**116**
Prizren	5-19	11	4	11	26
	20-99	2	1	2	5
	100+	1	0	1	2
	Total	**14**	**5**	**14**	**33**
Uroševac/Ferizaj	5-19	10	3	11	24
	20-99	3	1	2	6
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**13**	**4**	**13**	**30**
Grand Total		**108**	**56**	**55**	**270**

A.14.2. Status codes

	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Complete interviews **(Total)**	202	191	11
Incomplete interviews	0	0	0
Elegible in process	5	4	1
Refusals	89	79	10
Out of target	211	205	6
Impossible to contact	130	127	3
Ineligible - coop.	1	1	0
Refusal to the Screener	24	23	1
Total	662	630	32

	ELIGIBLES			
Eligible	1.Elegible establishment (Correct name and address)	273	253	20
	2. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the new firm/establishment bought the original firm/establishment)	0	0	0
	3. Eligible establishment (Different name but same address - the firm/establishment changed its name)	23	21	2
	4. Eligible establishment (Wrong address - the firm/establishmen has changed address and the address could be found)	0	0	0
	16. Panel firm - now less than five employees	0	0	0
Ineligible	5. The establishment has less than 5 permanent full time employees	20	20	0
	6. The firm discontinued businesses	164	159	5
	7. Not a business: private household	1	1	0
	8. Ineligible activity: education, agriculture, finances, governments…	26	25	1
Unobtainable	91. No reply *(after having called in different days of the week and in different business hours)*	106	103	3
	92. Line out of order	16	16	0
	93. No tone	0	0	0
	94. Phone number does not exist	8	8	0
	10. Answering machine	0	0	0
	11. Fax line - data line	0	0	0
	12. Wrong address/ moved away and could not get the new references	0	0	0
	13. Refuses to answer the screener	24	23	1
	14. In process *(the establishment is being called/ is being contacted - previous to ask the screener)*	11	6	5
	151. Out of target - outside the covered regions, firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	152. Out of target - firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	153. Impossible to find	1	1	0
	Total	673	636	37

A.14.3. Survey and item non-response

The number of completed interviews per contacted establishment was 0.31. This number is the result of two factors: explicit refusals to participate in the survey, as reflected by the rate of rejection (which includes rejections of the screener and the main survey) and the quality of the sampling frame, as represented by the presence of ineligible units. The number of rejections per contact was 0.17.

A.14.4. Local agency team involved in the study and its comments on the implementation

Local agency team involved in the survey

Local agency	Name: IPSOS DOOEL - Branch Office Country: Republic of Kosovo Membership of international organisation: N/A Activities since: 2010
Name of Project Manager	Bejtula Memeti
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Ivica Sokolovski, Project Director Edip Qormemeti, Field Manager Nevena Taskovska, Person responsible for data management/upload
Enumerators involved	Enumerators: 9 Recruiters: 2
Other staff involved	Fieldwork Coordinators: 3 Editing: 2 Data Entry: 5 Data Processing: 2

Sampling frame

Characteristic of sample frame used	Kosovo Business Registraton Agency and Serbian Business Registers Agency. Last update was in December 2011.
Source	Kosovo Business Registraton Agency and Serbian Business Registers Agency
Year of publication	2008
Comments on the quality of the sample frame	Two biggest problems with sampling frame were: 1. Lack of contact data; 2. not regularly updated with details of companies that have gone out of business 1. For some firms there were only street names, there were no building numbers, and/or telephone numbers and/or email addresses; and this data could not be found online, or in other sources. 2. There were a lot of extinguished companies.
Year and organisation that conducted the last economic census	N/A

Sample

Comments/problems on sectors and regions selected in the sample	There were no problems with sectors and regions selected in the sample.
Comments on the response rate	The response rate was constantly monitored. Overall, it is a reasonable response rate, keeping in mind this was a business survey with top management and a long questionnaire.
Comments on the sample design	The initally designed sample size of 270 companies to be interviewed was later reduced to 200 interviews.
Other comments	No comments

Fieldwork

Date of fieldwork	January 2013 – November 2013
Country	Republic of Kosovo
Number of completed interviews	202
Problems found during fieldwork	End of tax year led to a much slower rate of fieldwork progres in early 2013, as well as seasonal holidays during Ramadan Bajram and Kurban Bajram. Political interference in the business sector also influenced refusal rate and open responses, especially in the case of financial data and attitudinal questions.
Other observations	No comments

Questionnaires

Problems for the understanding of questions (write question number)	No comments
Problems found in the navigability of questionnaires (for example, skip patterns)	No comments
Comments on questionnaire length	No comments
Suggestions or other comments on the questionnaires	No comments

Quality control

Fieldwork monitoring	All interviewers who seemed to have issues with higher number of calls and no call backs, or those who reported refusals and unreachable companies were followed closely and replaced if it was discovered that there was a problem with the interviewer. The screening process was closely monitored and it was performed from the Ipsos office only (except in a few occasions where we had very successful field visits so there was no need to use the office staff for a successful scheduling of an interview). Each call/visit, or e-mailing was registered in separate excel sheets that were later submitted to the fieldwork supervisor and manager for further processing and decisions. Interview length was very much dependant on the respondent and type of company but due to close follow up by the office staff there was no room for poor-performance in this respect; we had constant monitoring of interviewers and their visits to the companies. Number and time of calls varied in accordance to company's management agenda. Supervisors checked if recruiters were following an appropriate pattern for calling the respondents - times of day/week, as well as moderation in order not to annoy the potential respondent by too many calls.
Data checking procedures	First 10% of interviews were checked upon completion and interviewers were briefed after each initial interview if any issues occurred, as well as checked further till it was clear that they had understood everything correctly and were not making any mistakes in routing or coding the answers. Additional checks were done on the data throughout fieldwork. If there was any missing data respondents were recontacted. Also, all sensitive questions were checked for refusal rates (in case of any 'systematic' patterns among individual interviewers, it was checked in the field if it was a respondent or interviewer issue).
Number of respondents selected for back-checking	50
Selection procedures	Randomly selected per individual interviewer and regions.
Who carried out back-checks?	Fieldwork team members who did not participate in the BEEPS research were involved under guidance by an experienced recruiter and supervisor.
Mode of contact	Telephone
Number of completed interviews back-checked	40
Number of non-responses back-checked	10
Results of alternative method of contacting non-respondents	No results from the alternative method, they simply refused to further provide answers to our staff complaining about having too much time taken for answering surveys that they perceive as having no impact in reality.
Description of what was covered inthe back-checks	Respondent's recall that the interview has taken place, the gender of the interviewer. Verification of general company details (No of employees, sector, address and similar) Main product check Length of interview

	Random questions selected from the questionnaire
Number of completed interviews that were rejected and why	One interview was rejected due to bad quality of recorded data; two interviews were rejected due to illegitimate company sector of activity; two interviews were rejected due to respondent's interruption of the interview and refusal to complete it at a later date.

Database

Data entry program chosen	SM-S (internally developed data entry program)
Comments on the data entry program	Private company software tool developed by Ipsos Belgrade and used for questionnaire programming, interviewing (CAPI), and data entry.
Comments on the data cleaning	There were no major issues during data cleaning, which was primarily based on very strict field and entry controls that were considered important and helpful in further data processing and cleaning, and they made the data cleaning process much smoother.

Country situation

General aspects of economic, political or social situation of the country that could affect the results of the survey	No comments
Relevant country events that occurred during fieldwork	Ramadan Bajram and Kurban Bajram, and other national holidays occuring throughout the fieldwork; end of tax year influenced a much slower pace in the second half of the fieldwork period.
Other aspects	No comments

A.15   Kyrgyz Republic

A.15.1.   Sampling structure and implementation

The first sampling frame was supplied by the World Bank and EBRD and consisted of enterprises interviewed in BEEPS IV. The World Bank and EBRD required that attempts should be made to re-interview establishments responding to the BEEPS IV survey where they were within the selected geographical regions and met eligibility criteria. That sample is referred to as the Panel. The second sampling frame used for the survey was a file of establishments purchased from the Statistical Office of the Kyrgyz Republic.

The quality of the frame was assessed at the onset of the project. The frame proved to be useful though it showed positive rates of non-eligibility, repetition, non-existent units, etc. These problems are typical of establishment surveys, but given the impact these inaccuracies may have on the results, adjustments were needed when computing the appropriate weights for individual observations. The percentage of confirmed non-eligible units as a proportion of the total number of contacts to complete the survey was 34.1% (444 out of 1301 establishments).

Regional stratification was defined in five regions. These regions are Bishkek City, Chui Oblast, Issyk-Kul Oblast, Jalalabad, and Osh Oblast.

Official regions	Grouping used for stratification purposes in BEEPS V
Bishkek city	Bishkek
Chui oblast	Chui + Talas
Talas Oblasty	
Jalalabad oblast	South
Osh oblast + Osh city	
Batken Oblasty	
Issyk – Kul oblast	Issyk – Kul
Naryn Oblasty	Naryn

Fresh sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Bishkek	5-19	277	111	264	652
	20-99	108	31	178	317
	100+	41	2	60	103
	Total	**426**	**144**	**502**	**1072**
Chui + Talas	5-19	134	24	101	259
	20-99	86	6	115	207
	100+	44	0	13	57
	Total	**264**	**30**	**229**	**523**
Issyk – Kul	5-19	29	8	72	109
	20-99	17	0	47	64
	100+	5	0	4	9
	Total	**51**	**8**	**123**	**182**
Naryn	5-19	5	2	32	39
	20-99	5	0	31	36
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**10**	**2**	**63**	**75**
South	5-19	151	54	154	359
	20-99	89	7	100	196
	100+	22	0	20	42
	Total	**262**	**61**	**274**	**597**
Grand Total		**1013**	**245**	**1191**	**2449**

Source: Statistical Office of the Kyrgyz Republic

Panel sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Bishkek	5-19	18	11	27	56
	20-99	9	1	16	26
	100+	6	0	4	10
	Total	**33**	**12**	**47**	**92**
Chui + Talas	5-19	1	3	3	7
	20-99	4	1	2	7
	100+	3	0	0	3
	Total	**8**	**4**	**5**	**17**
Issyk – Kul	5-19	6	1	3	10
	20-99	7	0	6	13
	100+	0	0	1	1
	Total	**13**	**1**	**10**	**24**
Naryn	5-19	0	0	0	0
	20-99	0	0	0	0
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
South	5-19	14	14	14	42
	20-99	6	1	10	17
	100+	6	0	1	7
	Total	**26**	**15**	**25**	**66**
Grand Total		**80**	**32**	**87**	**199**

Source: BEEPS IV.

Original sample design

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Bishkek	5-19	25	20	27	72
	20-99	13	6	18	37
	100+	6	1	6	13
	Total	**44**	**27**	**51**	**122**
Chui + Talas	5-19	11	4	9	24
	20-99	8	2	9	19
	100+	5	0	2	7
	Total	**24**	**6**	**20**	**50**
Issyk – Kul	5-19	4	2	8	14
	20-99	3	0	5	8
	100+	1	0	1	2
	Total	**8**	**2**	**14**	**24**
Naryn	5-19	1	1	4	6
	20-99	1	0	4	5
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**2**	**1**	**8**	**11**
South	5-19	13	8	14	35
	20-99	9	2	9	20
	100+	4	0	4	8
	Total	**26**	**10**	**27**	**63**
Grand Total		**104**	**46**	**120**	**270**

A.15.2. Status codes

	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Complete interviews **(Total)**	270	225	45
Incomplete interviews	0	0	0
Elegible in process	0	0	0
Refusals	32	30	2
Out of target	444	391	53
Impossible to contact	358	320	38
Ineligible - coop.	5	5	0
Refusal to the Screener	192	163	29
Total	1301	1134	167

	ELIGIBLES			
Eligible	1.Elegible establishment (Correct name and address)	290	245	45
	2. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the new firm/establishment bought the original firm/establishment)	0	0	0
	3. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the firm/establishment changed its name)	4	3	1
	4. Elegible establishment (Wrong address - the firm/establishmen has changed address and the address could be found)	8	7	1
	16. Panel firm - now less than five employees	0	0	0
Ineligible	5. The establishment has less than 5 permanent full time employees	4	4	0
	6. The firm discontinued businesses	372	329	43
	7. Not a business: private household	34	25	9
	8. Ineligible activity: education, agriculture, finances, governments…	34	33	1
Unobtainable	91. No reply *(after having called in different days of the week and in different business hours)*	119	105	14
	92. Line out of order	63	54	9
	93. No tone	8	7	1
	94. Phone number does not exist	40	35	5
	10. Answering machine	5	5	0
	11. Fax line - data line	0	0	0
	12. Wrong address/ moved away and could not get the new references	123	114	9
	13. Refuses to answer the screener	192	163	29
	14. In process *(the establishment is being called/ is being contacted - previous to ask the screener)*	0	0	0
	151. Out of target - outside the covered regions, firm moved abroad	1	1	0
	152. Out of target - firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	153. Impossible to find	4	4	0
	Total	1301	1134	167

A.15.3.   Survey and item non-response

The number of completed interviews per contacted establishment was 0.21. This number is the result of two factors: explicit refusals to participate in the survey, as reflected by the rate of rejection (which includes rejections of the screener and the main survey) and the quality of the sampling frame, as represented by the presence of ineligible units. The number of rejections per contact was 0.17.

A.15.4.   Local agency team involved in the study and its comments on the implementation

Local agency team involved in the survey

Local agency	Name: SIAR Research & Consulting Country: Kyrgyzstan Membership of international organisation:No Activities since: 1998
Name of Project Manager	Elnura Ibraeva
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Ainoura Sagynbaeva, Project Director Elmira Satylganova, Coordinator Rahat Djamaeva, Assistant Coordinator Nurseiit Raimzhanov, Assistant Coordinator
Enumerators involved	Enumerators: 16 Recruiters: 7
Other staff involved	Fieldwork Coordinators: 6 Editing: 7 Data Entry: 5 Data Processing: 3

Sampling frame

Characteristic of sample frame used	2011, it was from the Statistical committee
Source	N/A
Year of publication	2011
Comments on the quality of the sample frame	Sampling was outdated - Most of the enterprises had been already shut down, sold, contact numbers were obsolete.
Year and organisation that conducted the last economic census	Inapplicable
Other sources for companies statistics	No comments

Sample

Comments/problems on sectors and regions selected in the sample	There were problems almost in every region. The main problem was associated with obsolete data. There was not a lot of data on the internet to help locate firms. There were problems with the remote enterprises, it was necessary to spend 2 days on a trip there to fill in one questionnaire.
Comments on the response rate	NA
Comments on the sample design	There were not enough preferences issued at the beginning of the project, so it took time to receive the new preferences and move onto the next set of preferences.

Fieldwork

Date of fieldwork	December 2012 – July 2013
Country	Kyrgyz Republic
Number of completed interviews	270
Problems found during fieldwork	We frequently faced problems because of the political instability in the country. Many respondents didn't trust our interviewers because of this political context. In the South region in particular people didn't want to talk to our interviewers.
Other observations	No comments

Questionnaires

Problems for the understanding of questions (write question number)	Question number: • VIN.1: Question is very complicated to understand. The problem is that,

	the question located at the end, so respondents become tired and experience difficulties answering
Problems found in the navigability of questionnaires (for example, skip patterns)	No comments
Comments on questionnaire length	During the survey respondents noted that fact that the questionnaire was long
Suggestions or other comments on the questionnaires	Some respondents refused to answer the questions on finances, citing the confidentiality of the information.

Quality control

Fieldwork monitoring	We had supervisors in every region, who assigned the work to the interviewers. The recruitment call-center was established in the main office, where the work of the call-center operators was divided according to the different regions of Kyrgyzstan. Details regarding appointed interviews were then given to the supervisor, who in turn distributed them to interviewers. Thus, we managed to appoint and handle interviews more effectively. Interviewers remained more or less the same throughout fieldwork. If there was no result/no contact made after 10 calls, then we went back and searched the web sources and other possible sources of information. If the call -center operator was not effective, then we changed him/her. Interviewers were able to cope well with their work, they were very experienced and so we did not experience any serious problems.
Data checking procedures	The supervisors in every region controlled and checked the reliability and quality of completed questionnaires. Once this was done, these questionnaires were sent to main office in Bishkek, where they were checked a second time. If there was some unclear numerical data, then the company/respondent was called by phone and data/responses were clarified.
Number of respondents selected for back-checking	30
Selection procedures	Randomly selected
Who carried out back-checks?	The supervisors in the regions conducted the back-checks.
Mode of contact	Telephone
Number of completed interviews back-checked	30
Number of non-responses back-checked	0
Results of alternative method of contacting non-respondents	N/A
Description of what was covered inthe back-checks	Questions asked in back checks - Name of respondent, company name, activity of the company, legnth of the interview, number of employees.
Number of completed interviews that were rejected and why	Two questionnaires were declined because there did not have any information in the financial section, which meant they had a high level of item non-response.

Database

Data entry program chosen	SPSS, WebADC
Comments on the data entry program	SPSS
Comments on the data cleaning	

Country situation

General aspects of economic, political or social situation of the country that could affect the results of the survey	Political instability; in the summer of 2013 there were riots in the Issyk-Kul region. Also in the southern regions many entrepreneurs distrust survey research.

Relevant country events that occurred during fieldwork	End of the fiscal year. New-Year, 8 March, 21 March, 9 May, 31 August, Kurban Bairam, Summer Vacation Season
Other aspects	No comments

A.16 Latvia

A.16.1. Sampling structure and implementation

The first sampling frame was supplied by the World Bank and EBRD and consisted of enterprises interviewed in BEEPS IV. The World Bank and EBRD required that attempts should be made to re-interview establishments responding to the BEEPS IV survey where they were within the selected geographical regions and met eligibility criteria. That sample is referred to as the Panel. The source of the second sample frame was the March 2011 version of the Business Register of the National Statistical Bureau of Latvia. The sample was drawn by the Latvian agency based on instructions compiled by the World Bank and Ipsos MORI.

The quality of the frame was assessed at the onset of the project. The frame proved to be useful though it showed positive rates of non-eligibility, repetition, non-existent units, etc. These problems are typical of establishment surveys, but given the impact these inaccuracies may have on the results, adjustments were needed when computing the appropriate weights for individual observations. The percentage of confirmed non-eligible units as a proportion of the total number of contacts to complete the survey was 40.4% (612 out of 1513 establishments).

Regional stratification was defined in 6 regions. These regions are Riga, Pieriga, Vidzeme, Kurzeme, Zemgale, and Latgale (NUTS-3).

Fresh sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Kurzeme	5-19	20	48	110	178
	20-99	35	18	45	98
	100+	36	7	0	43
	Total	**91**	**73**	**155**	**319**
Latgale	5-19	18	53	84	155
	20-99	21	24	41	86
	100+	26	7	0	33
	Total	**65**	**84**	**125**	**274**
Pieriga	5-19	31	52	182	265
	20-99	26	20	46	92
	100+	25	12	28	65
	Total	**82**	**84**	**256**	**422**
Riga	5-19	81	244	731	1056
	20-99	73	124	256	453
	100+	67	84	152	303
	Total	**221**	**452**	**1,139**	**1,812**
Vidzeme	5-19	18	37	91	146
	20-99	25	26	30	81
	100+	27	8	0	35
	Total	**70**	**71**	**121**	**262**
Zemgale	5-19	12	40	83	135
	20-99	16	15	29	60
	100+	29	0	0	29
	Total	**57**	**55**	**112**	**224**
Grand Total		**586**	**819**	**1908**	**3313**

Source: Central Statistical Bureau of Latvia – Business Register, March 2011

Panel sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Kurzeme	5-19	2	6	4	12
	20-99	4	1	2	7
	100+	5	2	2	9
	Total	**11**	**9**	**8**	**28**
Latgale	5-19	1	4	2	7
	20-99	4	4	2	10
	100+	3	0	3	6
	Total	**8**	**8**	**7**	**23**
Pieriga	5-19	4	6	6	16
	20-99	3	2	4	9
	100+	7	5	3	15
	Total	**14**	**13**	**13**	**40**
Riga	5-19	13	12	12	37
	20-99	10	16	21	47
	100+	17	16	20	53
	Total	**40**	**44**	**53**	**137**
Vidzeme	5-19	2	3	1	6
	20-99	3	5	2	10
	100+	3	2	1	6
	Total	**8**	**10**	**4**	**22**
Zemgale	5-19	1	2	4	7
	20-99	3	1	3	7
	100+	3	4	0	7
	Total	**7**	**7**	**7**	**21**
Grand Total		**88**	**91**	**92**	**271**

Source: BEEPS IV.

Original sample design

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Kurzeme	5-19	6	10	6	22
	20-99	3	2	2	7
	100+	2	1	0	3
	Total	**11**	**13**	**8**	**32**
Latgale	5-19	6	9	7	22
	20-99	2	2	3	7
	100+	1	1	0	2
	Total	**9**	**12**	**10**	**31**
Pieriga	5-19	11	10	8	29
	20-99	4	2	3	9
	100+	2	1	2	5
	Total	**17**	**13**	**13**	**43**
Riga	5-19	22	25	25	72
	20-99	8	6	11	25
	100+	3	2	6	11
	Total	**33**	**33**	**42**	**108**
Vidzeme	5-19	6	7	6	19
	20-99	3	2	2	7
	100+	2	1	0	3
	Total	**11**	**10**	**8**	**29**
Zemgale	5-19	5	7	6	18
	20-99	2	2	3	7
	100+	2	0	0	2
	Total	**9**	**9**	**9**	**27**
Grand Total		**90**	**90**	**90**	**270**

A.16.2. Status codes

	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Complete interviews **(Total)**	336	244	92
Incomplete interviews	0	0	0
Elegible in process	0	0	0
Refusals	1	1	0
Out of target	612	577	35
Impossible to contact	280	222	58
Ineligible - coop.	4	0	4
Refusal to the Screener	280	228	52
Total	1513	1272	241

	ELIGIBLES			
Eligible	1.Elegible establishment (Correct name and address)	338	245	93
	2. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the new firm/establishment bought the original firm/establishment)	0	0	0
	3. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the firm/establishment changed its name)	0	0	0
	4. Elegible establishment (Wrong address - the firm/establishmen has changed address and the address could be found)	0	0	0
	16. Panel firm - now less than five employees	0	0	0
Ineligible	5. The establishment has less than 5 permanent full time employees	335	335	0
	6. The firm discontinued businesses	256	222	34
	7. Not a business: private household	9	9	0
	8. Ineligible activity: education, agriculture, finances, governments…	12	11	1
Unobtainable	91. No reply *(after having called in different days of the week and in different business hours)*	75	59	16
	92. Line out of order	31	24	7
	93. No tone	9	5	4
	94. Phone number does not exist	82	61	21
	10. Answering machine	5	4	1
	11. Fax line - data line	4	4	0
	12. Wrong address/ moved away and could not get the new references	74	65	9
	13. Refuses to answer the screener	280	228	52
	14. In process *(the establishment is being called/ is being contacted - previous to ask the screener)*	4	1	3
	151. Out of target - outside the covered regions, firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	152. Out of target - firm moved abroad	3	0	3
	153. Impossible to find	1	0	1
	Total	1518	1273	245

A.16.3.   Survey and item non-response

The number of completed interviews per contacted establishment was 0.22. This number is the result of two factors: explicit refusals to participate in the survey, as reflected by the rate of rejection (which includes rejections of the screener and the main survey) and the quality of the sampling frame, as represented by the presence of ineligible units. The number of rejections per contact was 0.19.

A.16.4. Local agency team involved in the study and its comments on the implementation

Local agency team involved in the survey

Local agency	Name: LatvianFacts, Ltd. Country: Latvia Membership of international organisation: Activities since: 1991
Name of Project Manager	Daiga Koceviča
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Project Director: Oksana Kurcalte Field Manager: Ilze Gansone Person responsible for data management/upload: Askolds Altenburgs
Enumerators involved	Enumerators and recruiters: 64
Other staff involved	Fieldwork Coordinators: 4 Editing: 2 Data Entry: 2 Data Processing: 1

Sampling frame

Characteristic of sample frame used	Sample provided by National Statistical Bureau of Latvia (2011, March)
Source	National Statistical Bureau of Latvia
Year of publication	2011
Comments on the quality of the sample frame	Around of 40% of the database had invalid contacts (wrong or suspended telephone numbers, wrong addresses, non existing firms) and the contact information had to be found from other sources.
Year and organisation that conducted the last economic census	-

Sample

Comments/problems on sectors and regions selected in the sample	The companies from Pieriga region were the hardest to persuade to take part in the survey.
Comments on the response rate	None.
Comments on the sample design	None.

Fieldwork

Date of fieldwork	January 2013 – December 2013
Country	Latvia
Number of completed interviews	336
Problems found during fieldwork	The most important problem during field work was the low response rate (many refusals); in general the BEEPS target was hard to reach. Majority of refusals were because respondents are afraid to provide financial information which they consider confidential. There were also difficulties reaching appropriate respondents in larger companies because gatekeepers (secretary or assistant) refused to put interviewers in touch with senior managers.
Other observations	-

Questionnaires

Problems for the understanding of questions (write question number)	Question number: a) C9: difficult to assess the extent of the financial loss- companies typically do not carry out that types of calculation b) H- Innovations: Respondents had difficulties to understand the term „innovation" and interviewers had to explain it (for explanation we used the information in interviewer manual).
Problems found in the navigability	None

of questionnaires (for example, skip patterns)	
Comments on questionnaire length	Respondents complained that the questionnaire is very long and it contains questions that require detailed information. In many cases respondents refused due to the length of interview.
Suggestions or other comments on the questionnaires	None

Quality control

Fieldwork monitoring	Since the screening took place at our CATI Center, recruiters were continuously supervised by the CATI supervisors. The team of interviewers was small for this project, but highly experienced. Interviewers were not changed They were assisted by phone (if necessary) during the interviews or by the Project manager. Project Manager personally communicated to them the errors that they have been doing in the process of completing of questionnaires. We had 2 interviewers that were removed during fieldwork.
Data checking procedures	Regional supervisors and Project manager controlled and checked the reliability and quality of completed questionnaires, If there was some unclear/missing data, then the appropriate company/respondent was called by phone and the data was clarified After data entry, the data was checked based on the questionnaire and with the aid of syntaxes provided by Ipsos.
Number of respondents selected for back-checking	95
Selection procedures	Randomly selected, minimum 5% of completed questionnaires by interviewer.
Who carried out back-checks?	We have a separate department - Quality and Control Department- located in our CATI Centre where all back-checks are conducted. These Quality Control interviewers were not involved in the main BEEPs survey.
Mode of contact	Telephone
Number of completed interviews back-checked	72
Number of non-responses back-checked	23
Results of alternative method of contacting non-respondents	No alternative method.
Description of what was covered inthe back-checks	Questions asked in back checks: - If they were visited by one of our interviewers and they answered to the questions - Company name and location - Length of interview - Details of main product - Number of employees - Main activity - Work quality evaluation of the interviewer
Number of completed interviews that were rejected and why	We removed 5 questionnaires because there was a high level of item-nonresponse and when they were recontacted they refused to provide any more answers.

Database

Data entry program chosen	SPSS, WebADC
Comments on the data entry program	None.
Comments on the data cleaning	None.

Country situation

General aspects of economic, political or social situation of the	Consequences of global Economical crisis; introduction of the Euro in Latvia.

country that could affect the results of the survey	
Relevant country events that occurred during fieldwork	Elections of municipality; End of the tax year; Income statements; New Year and Christmas; Eastern; Mid Summer celebration; period of summer holidays.
Other aspects	None.

A.17 Lithuania

A.17.1.   Sampling structure and implementation

The first sampling frame was supplied by the World Bank and EBRD and consisted of enterprises interviewed in BEEPS IV. The World Bank and EBRD required that attempts should be made to re-interview establishments responding to the BEEPS IV survey where they were within the selected geographical regions and met eligibility criteria. That sample is referred to as the Panel. The source of the second sample frame was Creditreform Lietuva – September 2012- Organisation database.

The quality of the frame was assessed at the onset of the project. The frame proved to be useful though it showed positive rates of non-eligibility, repetition, non-existent units, etc. These problems are typical of establishment surveys, but given the impact these inaccuracies may have on the results, adjustments were needed when computing the appropriate weights for individual observations. The percentage of confirmed non-eligible units as a proportion of the total number of contacts to complete the survey was 3.4% (50 out of 1488 establishments).

Regional stratification was defined in 4 regions. These regions are Coast and West, North East, South West and Vilniaus. Table below shows the grouping of NUTS-3 regions into these four regions.

NUTS-3 regions	Grouping used for stratification purposes in BEEPS V
Vilniaus	Vilniaus
Klaipedos	Coast+West
Taurages	
Telsiu	
Panevezio	North-East
Siauliu	
Utenos	
Alytaus	South-West
Kauno	
Marijampoles	

Fresh sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Coast+West	5-19	75	90	107	272
	20-99	61	50	29	140
	100+	34	5	5	44
	Total	**170**	**145**	**141**	**456**
North-East	5-19	76	82	81	239
	20-99	61	52	25	138
	100+	14	11	3	28
	Total	**151**	**145**	**109**	**405**
South-West	5-19	121	129	141	391
	20-99	72	57	28	157
	100+	43	15	14	72
	Total	**236**	**201**	**183**	**620**
Vilniaus	5-19	112	126	180	418
	20-99	58	71	43	172
	100+	30	28	14	72
	Total	**200**	**225**	**237**	**662**
Grand Total		**757**	**716**	**670**	**2144**

Source: Creditreform Lietuva database (September 2012)

Panel sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Coast+West	5-19	6	7	7	20
	20-99	2	4	7	13
	100+	1	0	4	5
	Total	**9**	**11**	**18**	**38**
North-East	5-19	4	4	16	24
	20-99	2	2	11	15
	100+	4	1	6	11
	Total	**10**	**7**	**33**	**50**
South-West	5-19	4	5	6	15
	20-99	0	6	17	23
	100+	2	2	13	17
	Total	**6**	**13**	**36**	**55**
Vilniaus	5-19	5	7	12	24
	20-99	5	1	11	17
	100+	6	3	13	22
	Total	**16**	**11**	**36**	**63**
Grand Total		**41**	**42**	**123**	**206**

Source: BEEPS IV.

Original sample design

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Coast+West	5-19	9	11	13	33
	20-99	7	6	4	17
	100+	4	1	1	6
	Total	**20**	**18**	**18**	**56**
North-East	5-19	9	10	11	30
	20-99	7	6	4	17
	100+	2	3	1	6
	Total	**18**	**19**	**16**	**53**
South-West	5-19	**14**	**15**	**17**	**46**
	20-99	8	7	5	20
	100+	5	3	3	11
	Total	**27**	**25**	**25**	**77**
Vilniaus	5-19	13	15	22	50
	20-99	7	8	6	21
	100+	5	5	3	13
	Total	**25**	**28**	**31**	**84**
Grand Total		**90**	**90**	**90**	**270**

A.17.2. Status codes

	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Complete interviews **(Total)**	270	225	45
Incomplete interviews	0	0	0
Elegible in process	4	4	0
Refusals	179	141	38
Out of target	50	48	2
Impossible to contact	98	77	21
Ineligible - coop.	6	6	0
Refusal to the Screener	881	766	115
Total	1488	1267	221

	ELIGIBLES			
Eligible	1.Elegible establishment (Correct name and address)	451	368	83
Eligible	2. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the new firm/establishment bought the original firm/establishment)	0	0	0
Eligible	3. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the firm/establishment changed its name)	0	0	0
Eligible	4. Elegible establishment (Wrong address - the firm/establishmen has changed address and the address could be found)	2	2	0
Eligible	16. Panel firm - now less than five employees	0	0	0
Ineligible	5. The establishment has less than 5 permanent full time employees	31	31	0
Ineligible	6. The firm discontinued businesses	17	15	2
Ineligible	7. Not a business: private household	0	0	0
Ineligible	8. Ineligible activity: education, agriculture, finances, governments…	2	2	0
Unobtainable	91. No reply *(after having called in different days of the week and in different business hours)*	47	40	7
Unobtainable	92. Line out of order	2	1	1
Unobtainable	93. No tone	5	2	3
Unobtainable	94. Phone number does not exist	37	29	8
Unobtainable	10. Answering machine	7	5	2
Unobtainable	11. Fax line - data line	0	0	0
Unobtainable	12. Wrong address/ moved away and could not get the new references	0	0	0
	13. Refuses to answer the screener	881	766	115
	14. In process *(the establishment is being called/ is being contacted - previous to ask the screener)*	6	6	0
	151. Out of target - outside the covered regions, firm moved abroad	4	4	0
	152. Out of target - firm moved abroad	1	1	0
	153. Impossible to find	1	1	0
	Total	1494	1273	221

A.17.3.   Survey and item non-response

The number of completed interviews per contacted establishment was 0.18. This number is the result of two factors: explicit refusals to participate in the survey, as reflected by the rate of rejection (which includes rejections of the screener and the main survey) and the quality of the sampling frame, as represented by the presence of ineligible units. The number of rejections per contact was 0.71.

A.17.4. Local agency team involved in the study and its comments on the implementation

Local agency team involved in the survey

Local agency	Name: RAIT Ltd. Country: Lithuania Membership of international organisation: ESOMAR, Factum group / MSPA ("Mystery Shopper" providers association) Activities since: 2002
Name of Project Manager	Agnė Gailiušaitė (Vytautas Stankevičius prior to August 2013)
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Danutė Suzanovičienė (Fieldwork Director), Rima Kalesnykienė (Data Processing)
Enumerators involved	Enumerators: 51 Recruiters: 11
Other staff involved	Fieldwork Coordinators: 3 Editing: 1 Data Entry: 2 Data Processing: 1

Sampling frame

Characteristic of sample frame used	The sample frame was bought from data bases supplier Creditreform Lietuva.
Source	"Creditreform Lietuva". Since 1993 this company works on credit reports (companies and persons credit limit evaluation and rating-scoring systems), debt collection, marketing information and on-line database production.
Year of publication	2012
Comments on the quality of the sample frame	None
Year and organisation that conducted the last economic census	NA

Sample

Comments/problems on sectors and regions selected in the sample	On sectors: None On regions: None
Comments on the response rate	Low response rate due to difficult target group (managers), the interview length (~40-60 min.) and the methodology (face-to-face).
Comments on the sample design	None
Other comments	-

Fieldwork

Date of fieldwork	January 2013 – October 2013
Country	Lithuania
Number of completed interviews	270
Problems found during fieldwork	The main problems were due to the length of the survey and the time required of senior staff members. Little interest in general (respondents do not see any benefit in participating in the survey). There were some cases where permission to enter an enterprise was denied to interviewers (this was mainly a problem with larger enterprises). It was sometimes difficult to get through gatekeepers, again, this was mostly the case with large companies. When conducting surveys, main problems were with questions about financial information, informal payments and also some questions annoyed the respondents because they were not perceived as applicable (e. g. about power outages)
Other observations	None

Questionnaires

Problems for the understanding of questions (write question number)	No problems found.
Problems found in the navigability of questionnaires (for example, skip patterns)	No problems here.
Comments on questionnaire length	The questionnaires are too long, even for a face-to-face interview.
Suggestions or other comments on the questionnaires	

Quality control

Fieldwork monitoring	Every interviewer was monitored closely; three were replaced shortly after the beginning of fieldwork because they did not meet expectations (e.g. not enough B2B experience, unable to engage business people with the survey). Another was removed from the project after they claimed a certain firm would not participate, and another interviewer sent to the same firm was able to conduct the survey. Call outcomes in the screener were also strictly monitored in order to check whether they were conducted according to the instructions and enough attempts to contact the company had been made before abandoning the firm.
Data checking procedures	All questionnaires were checked by eye after completion and data (consistency, number of refused questions, skip patterns, etc.) was checked on an ongoing basis.
Number of respondents selected for back-checking	41
Selection procedures	Random selection
Who carried out back-checks?	Fieldwork co-ordinators
Mode of contact	Telephone
Number of completed interviews back-checked	40
Number of non-responses back-checked	1
Results of alternative method of contacting non-respondents	As it wasn't possible to get back to one of the interviewed respondents randomly selected for back-checking due to his absence in Lithuania, fieldwork coordinators contacted two other enterprises surveyed by the same interviewer in order to verify the completion of the survey with them.
Description of what was covered inthe back-checks	They were asked to confirm whether they had participated in the survey, the approximate length of the interview and what questions they remember from the survey.
Number of completed interviews that were rejected and why	Four interviews were rejected, two due to survey non-completion, and two duie to high non-response percentages, coupled with refusal to give more information on recontact

Database

Data entry program chosen	SPSS, WebADC
Comments on the data entry program	None
Comments on the data cleaning	None

Country situation

General aspects of economic, political or social situation of the country that could affect the results of the survey	
Relevant country events that	Fieldwork slowed during summertime, partly as this was the end of the

occurred during fieldwork	fieldwork period, but also due to the high holiday season
Other aspects	None

A.18 Moldova

A.18.1. Sampling structure and implementation

The first sampling frame was supplied by the World Bank and EBRD and consisted of enterprises interviewed in BEEPS IV. The World Bank and EBRD required that attempts should be made to re-interview establishments responding to the BEEPS IV survey where they were within the selected geographical regions and met eligibility criteria. That sample is referred to as the Panel. The source of the second sampling frame was the National Bureau of Statistics of the Republic of Moldova.

The quality of the frame was assessed at the onset of the project. The frame proved to be useful though it showed positive rates of non-eligibility, repetition, non-existent units, etc. These problems are typical of establishment surveys, but given the impact these inaccuracies may have on the results, adjustments were needed when computing the appropriate weights for individual observations. The percentage of confirmed non-eligible units as a proportion of the total number of contacts to complete the survey was 10.2% (62 out of 606 establishments).

Regional stratification was defined in 4 regions. These regions are North, Centre, South, and South East (Transnistria). Table below shows the grouping of municipalities and raions into these 4 regions.

Grouping used for stratification purposes in BEEPS V (municipalities in brackets)
North (municipality Balti, raionuls Briceni, Donduseni, Drochia, Edinet, Falesti, Floresti, Glodeni, Rezina, Riscani, Singerei, Ocnita, Soroca, Soldanesti)
Center (municipality Chisinau, raionuls Anenii Noi, Causeni, Calarasi, Criuleni, Hincesti, Ialoveni, Leova, Nisporeni, Orhei, Straseni, Ungheni, Telenesti)
South (republica Gaugazia, municipality Comrat, raionuls Cahul, Cantemir, Cimislia, Taraclia)
South East – Transdnistria (municipality Bender, Tiraspol, raionuls Basarabeasca, Dubasari, Stefan Voda)

Fresh sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Center	5-19	334	364	291	989
	20-99	178	102	231	511
	100+	82	31	34	147
	Total	**594**	**497**	**556**	**1647**
North	5-19	118	149	155	422
	20-99	46	50	58	154
	100+	38	3	14	55
	Total	**202**	**202**	**227**	**631**
South	5-19	66	137	76	279
	20-99	40	27	31	98
	100+	11	0	2	13
	Total	**117**	**164**	**109**	**390**
South East (Transdnistria)	5-19	24	36	30	90
	20-99	5	0	1	6
	100+	3	0	0	3
	Total	**32**	**36**	**31**	**99**
Grand Total		**945**	**899**	**923**	**2767**

Source: National Bureau of Statistics of the Republic of Moldova

Panel sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Center	5-19	17	32	42	91
	20-99	29	24	38	91
	100+	17	11	20	48
	Total	**63**	**67**	**100**	**230**
North	5-19	7	12	7	26
	20-99	8	9	5	22
	100+	7	1	1	9
	Total	**22**	**22**	**13**	**57**
South	5-19	6	8	5	19
	20-99	5	4	6	15
	100+	4	0	2	6
	Total	**15**	**12**	**13**	**40**
South East (Transdnistria)	5-19	2	7	5	14
	20-99	1	0	5	6
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**3**	**7**	**10**	**20**
Grand Total		**103**	**108**	**136**	**347**

Source: BEEPS IV.

Original sample design

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Center	5-19	39	44	37	120
	20-99	23	14	30	67
	100+	11	7	6	24
	Total	73	65	73	211
North	5-19	14	18	18	50
	20-99	6	7	7	20
	100+	5	1	2	8
	Total	25	26	27	78
South	5-19	8	16	9	33
	20-99	5	5	4	14
	100+	2	0	1	3
	Total	15	21	14	50
South East (Transdnistria)	5-19	4	8	4	16
	20-99	2	0	2	4
	100+	1	0	0	1
	Total	7	8	6	21
Grand Total		120	120	120	360

A.18.2. Status codes

	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Complete interviews **(Total)**	360	177	183
Incomplete interviews	12	8	4
Elegible in process	0	0	0
Refusals	42	28	14
Out of target	62	16	46
Impossible to contact	35	25	10
Ineligible - coop.	1	1	0
Refusal to the Screener	94	55	39
Total	606	310	296

	ELIGIBLES			
Eligible	1.Elegible establishment (Correct name and address)	368	192	176
	2. Eligible establishment (Different name but same address - the new firm/establishment bought the original firm/establishment)	4	2	2
	3. Eligible establishment (Different name but same address - the firm/establishment changed its name)	8	6	2
	4. Elegible establishment (Wrong address - the firm/establishmen has changed address and the address could be found)	34	13	21
	16. Panel firm - now less than five employees	0	0	0
Ineligible	5. The establishment has less than 5 permanent full time employees	0	0	0
	6. The firm discontinued businesses	50	10	40
	7. Not a business: private household	6	3	3
	8. Ineligible activity: education, agriculture, finances, governments…	6	3	3
Unobtainable	91. No reply *(after having called in different days of the week and in different business hours)*	10	9	1
	92. Line out of order	0	0	0
	93. No tone	0	0	0
	94. Phone number does not exist	0	0	0
	10. Answering machine	1	0	1
	11. Fax line - data line	0	0	0
	12. Wrong address/ moved away and could not get the new references	24	16	8
	13. Refuses to answer the screener	94	55	39
	14. In process *(the establishment is being called/ is being contacted - previous to ask the screener)*	1	1	0
	151. Out of target - outside the covered regions, firm moved abroad	1	1	0
	152. Out of target - firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	153. Impossible to find	0	0	0
	Total	607	311	296

A.18.3. Survey and item non-response

The number of completed interviews per contacted establishment was 0.59. This number is the result of two factors: explicit refusals to participate in the survey, as reflected by the rate of rejection (which includes rejections of the screener and the main survey) and the quality of the sampling frame, as represented by the presence of ineligible units. The number of rejections per contact was 0.22.

126

A.18.4.   Local agency team involved in the study and its comments on the implementation

Local agency team involved in the survey

Local agency	Name: IMAS-INC SRL Country: Republic of Moldova Membership of international organisation: ESOMAR Activities since: 2001
Name of Project Manager	Doru Petruti
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Ecaterina Sofroni Veronica Ates
Enumerators involved	Enumerators: 27 Recruiters: 3 10 enumerators also did part of the recruitment
Other staff involved	Fieldwork coordinators, coders, data entry and processing staff

Sampling frame

Characteristic of sample frame used	
Source	Enterprise Labor Income Survey, National Bureau of Statistics
Year of publication	2011
Comments on the quality of the sample frame	
Year and organisation that conducted the last economic census	2011 - National Bureau of Statistics

Sample

Comments/problems on sectors and regions selected in the sample	None
Comments on the response rate	Lower than 2009, as expected.
Comments on the sample design	None.
Other comments	None.

Fieldwork

Date of fieldwork	November 2012 - July 2013
Country	Republic of Moldova
Number of completed interviews	360
Problems found during fieldwork	Most refusals occurred because companies weren't open to declaring their income. They were afraid that this information could be used against them, or would create problems for their normal activities. We recorded an increase in the rate of refusals around national and religious holidays and during the political crises in March – June 2013, when the Prime minister and his government were dismissed and the Alliance for European Integration party disbanded.
Other observations	None.

Questionnaires

Problems for the understanding of questions (write question number)	None.
Problems found in the navigability of questionnaires (for example, skip patterns)	Some problems understanding N6, N7, L9a and L9a2
Comments on questionnaire length	None.
Suggestions or other comments on	None.

the questionnaires	

Quality control

Fieldwork monitoring	At the training we mentioned to the interviewers if they have a low response rate on answers or a high rate on noncontact then they would be taken off the interviewing team, and this was enforced. Our focus for this project was not to have a big team of interviewers, but to have a smaller team working at higher quality. They were assisted by phone (if necessary) during interviews or fieldwork by fieldwork coordinators, fieldwork manager and country manager. The Project Manager personally communicated to interviewers the errors that they had been making in the process of completing of questionnaires. Also, to ensure the highest success rate in areas with the highest refusal and postponements rate (Chisinau) interviewers were rotated. We had 4 interviewers that were removed because of work quality. One interviewer with a high response rate was removed owing to health problems. For all contacts, we ensured that they have been visited/contacted at least 10 times before coding a refusal. We also monitored the item non-response/refusal rate for questions requiring accounts information.
Data checking procedures	The first completed questionnaire from every interviewer was checked for mistakes. Data was checked on an ongoing basis throughout fieldwork.
Number of respondents selected for back-checking	77
Selection procedures	Randomly selected, minimum 5 % of completed questionnaires per interviewer
Who carried out back-checks?	We have a separate team of quality control CATI interviewers, who did not work on the main BEEPs survey who conducted the back-checks
Mode of contact	Telephone (Face to face for non-responses)
Number of completed interviews back-checked	55
Number of non-responses back-checked	20
Results of alternative method of contacting non-respondents	No alternative method was used
Description of what was covered inthe back-checks	Questions asked in back checks – - If they were visited by one of our interviewers and they answered the questions - If there where anybody else who answered some questions from the questionnaire - The estimated length of the interview - Details of main product - Number of employees - The language used to complete the questionnaire - Work quality evaluation of the interviewer
Number of completed interviews that were rejected and why	We removed 12 questionnaires because there was a high level of item-nonresponse and when they were recontacted they refused to provide any more answers.

Database

Data entry program chosen	SPSS, WebADC
Comments on the data entry program	None.
Comments on the data cleaning	None.

Country situation

General aspects of economic, political or social situation of the	Political demise of the Prime Minister, Alliance for European Integration Party has been disbanded

country that could affect the results of the survey	
Relevant country events that occurred during fieldwork	Holidays: New year, Christmas, 8 March (IWD), Easter, End of the tax year, Income statements (March - April). Political – Elections and the fall of the Alliance for European Integration Party
Other aspects	None.

A.19 Mongolia

A.19.1.   Sampling structure and implementation

The first sample frame was supplied by the World Bank and EBRD and consisted of enterprises interviewed in BEEPS 20008/9. The World Bank and EBRD required that attempts should be made to re-interview establishments responding to the BEEPS 2008/09 survey where they were within the selected geographical regions and met eligibility criteria. That sample is referred to as the Panel. The source of the second sample frame was the National Statistical Office of Mongolia.

The quality of the frame was assessed at the onset of the project. The frame proved to be useful though it showed positive rates of non-eligibility, repetition, non-existent units, etc. These problems are typical of establishment surveys, but given the impact these inaccuracies may have on the results, adjustments were needed when computing the appropriate weights for individual observations. The percentage of confirmed non-eligible units as a proportion of the total number of contacts to complete the survey was 10.2% (59 out of 578 establishments).

Regional stratification was defined in 5 regions. These regions are Central, West, Khangai, East, and Ulaanbaatar.

Regions	Grouping used for stratification purposes in BEEPS V (aimags in brackets)
Central (incl. Ulaanbaatar)	**Central** (Gobisumber, Darkhan-Uul, Dornogobi, Dundgobi, Omnogobi, Selenge, Tov)
	Ulaanbaatar
East	**East** (Dornod, Sukhbaatar, Khentii)
Khangai	**Khangai** (Arkhangai, Bayankhongor, Bulgan, Orkhon, Ovorkhangai, Khuvsgul)
West	**West** (Bayan-Ulgii, Gobi-Altai, Zavkhan, Uvs, Khovd)

Fresh sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Central	5-19	75	96	117	288
	20-99	33	3	42	78
	100+	5	0	3	8
	Total	**113**	**99**	**162**	**374**
East	5-19	25	41	34	100
	20-99	6	8	16	30
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**31**	**49**	**50**	**130**
Khangai	5-19	93	79	110	282
	20-99	32	5	25	62
	100+	0	0	6	6
	Total	**125**	**84**	**141**	**350**
Ulaanbaatar	5-19	340	393	257	990
	20-99	175	58	179	412
	100+	36	9	79	124
	Total	**551**	**460**	**515**	**1526**
West	5-19	71	49	71	191
	20-99	28	3	24	55
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**99**	**52**	**95**	**246**
Grand Total		**919**	**744**	**963**	**2626**

Source: Mongolian National Statistics Office – Register of Establishments

Panel sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Central	5-19	6	7	9	22
	20-99	4	1	3	8
	100+	2	0	0	2
	Total	**12**	**8**	**12**	**32**
East	5-19	3	2	2	7
	20-99	0	0	2	2
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**3**	**2**	**4**	**9**
Khangai	5-19	6	4	7	17
	20-99	6	1	2	9
	100+	0	0	2	2
	Total	**12**	**5**	**11**	**28**
Ulaanbaatar	5-19	11	14	22	47
	20-99	14	5	28	47
	100+	12	2	11	25
	Total	**37**	**21**	**61**	**119**
West	5-19	1	2	10	13
	20-99	2	0	3	5
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**3**	**2**	**13**	**18**
Grand Total		**67**	**38**	**101**	**206**

Source: BEEPS IV.

Original sample design

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Central	5-19	9	16	14	39
	20-99	5	1	5	11
	100+	2	0	1	3
	Total	**16**	**17**	**20**	**53**
East	5-19	5	8	4	17
	20-99	1	2	2	5
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**6**	**10**	**6**	**22**
Khangai	5-19	11	12	13	36
	20-99	6	2	3	11
	100+	0	0	2	2
	Total	**17**	**14**	**18**	**49**
Ulaanbaatar	5-19	39	54	31	124
	20-99	21	13	23	57
	100+	8	2	10	20
	Total	**68**	**69**	**64**	**201**
West	5-19	8	9	9	26
	20-99	5	1	3	9
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**13**	**10**	**12**	**35**
Grand Total		**120**	**120**	**120**	**360**

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total

A.19.2. Status codes

	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Complete interviews **(Total)**	360	229	131
Incomplete interviews	0	0	0
Elegible in process	0	0	0
Refusals	9	8	1
Out of target	59	46	13
Impossible to contact	86	72	14
Ineligible - coop.	0	0	0
Refusal to the Screener	64	45	19
Total	578	400	178

	ELIGIBLES			
Eligible	1.Elegible establishment (Correct name and address)	369	237	132
Eligible	2. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the new firm/establishment bought the original firm/establishment)	0	0	0
Eligible	3. Eligible establishment (Different name but same address - the firm/establishment changed its name)	0	0	0
Eligible	4. Eligible establishment (Wrong address - the firm/establishmen has changed address and the address could be found)	0	0	0
Eligible	16. Panel firm - now less than five employees	0	0	0
Ineligible	5. The establishment has less than 5 permanent full time employees	14	13	1
Ineligible	6. The firm discontinued businesses	39	28	11
Ineligible	7. Not a business: private household	0	0	0
Ineligible	8. Ineligible activity: education, agriculture, finances, governments…	6	5	1
Unobtainable	91. No reply *(after having called in different days of the week and in different business hours)*	30	24	6
Unobtainable	92. Line out of order	0	0	0
Unobtainable	93. No tone	19	17	2
Unobtainable	94. Phone number does not exist	1	1	0
Unobtainable	10. Answering machine	1	1	0
Unobtainable	11. Fax line - data line	3	1	2
Unobtainable	12. Wrong address/ moved away and could not get the new references	32	28	4
	13. Refuses to answer the screener	64	45	19
	14. In process *(the establishment is being called/ is being contacted - previous to ask the screener)*	0	0	0
	151. Out of target - outside the covered regions, firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	152. Out of target - firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	153. Impossible to find	0	0	0
	Total	578	400	178

A.19.3.   Survey and item non-response

The number of completed interviews per contacted establishment was 0.62. This number is the result of two factors: explicit refusals to participate in the survey, as reflected by the rate of rejection (which includes rejections of the screener and the main survey) and the quality of the sampling frame, as represented by the presence of ineligible units. The number of rejections per contact was 0.13.

A.19.4. Local agency team involved in the study and its comments on the implementation

Local agency team involved in the survey

Local agency	Name: SIAR Research & Consulting Country: Mongolia Membership of international organisation: No Activities since: 1998
Name of Project Manager	Jamala Umankulova
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Ainoura Sagynbaeva, Project Director Elnura Ibraeva, Field Manager, Data management Elmira Satylganova, Coordinator
Enumerators involved	Enumerators: 25 Recruiters: 4
Other staff involved	Fieldwork Coordinators: 3 Editing: 3 Data Entry: 3 Data Processing: 2

Sampling frame

Characteristic of sample frame used	Business Register, National Statistical Office (NSO), Mongolia
Source	Business Register, National Statistical Office (NSO), Mongolia
Year of publication	2012
Comments on the quality of the sample frame	Good quality
Year and organisation that conducted the last economic census	-

Sample

Comments/problems on sectors and regions selected in the sample	Companies from Khangai and Western regions were difficult to recruit for the BEEPS survey. Retail companies were reluctant to provide financial data.
Comments on the response rate	-
Comments on the sample design	Availability of sufficient number of preferences made the fieldwork and the screening more efficient.

Fieldwork

Date of fieldwork	December 2012 - July 2013
Country	Mongolia
Number of completed interviews	360
Problems found during fieldwork	During the fieldwork there were a number of refusals for several reasons including "no time for survey", "did not want to participate", and "this survey will have no impact / it will not be useful for our enterprise if we participate in such a survey". Several companies initially agreed to participate in the survey but refused later and did not participate in the survey. Their reasons were "no time for survey" and some were due to holiday time being around the corner, etc. In terms of recruitment, there were some difficulties related to holiday seasons, and external factors such as elections. It was hard if companies changed their phone numbers and were unreachable by phone or through the information on their website. During the fieldwork there were 4 national holidays: Lunar New Year (February), New Year (January), election (May), Naadam festival (July). It was very difficult to recruit companies prior to the national holidays and vacation season (June-July). Also change of staff from call-center working on BEEPS project affected the flow of work.
Other observations	No comments

Questionnaires

Problems for the understanding of questions (write question number)	Question number: a) B2: For the companies who selected code 3 at the question B1, the B2 question seemed to be repetitive the response is automatically 100%. b) C7: C7 was not easy to understand for respondents unless explained c) C9, I2, I4, J7: For these questions, the interviewers found it easier / more accurate to ask about actual expenditure rather than percentages d) D1a1: even if we asked the respondent to respond in detail or more precisely, they tended to answer generally e) E6: the majority of respondents seemed to struggle with understanding this question and responded quickly as No. f) H: For innovation questions the showcards were useful to help the respondents answer correctly. If there were no cards or examples it would have been difficult to answer without explanation. g) G1: difficult to understand unless the interviewer explained very clearly and it was a very experienced interviewer h) VIN 1: Since VIN1 was at the end of questionnaire some respondents seemed to answer without thinking thouroughly
Problems found in the navigability of questionnaires (for example, skip patterns)	No problems
Comments on questionnaire length	Generally, respondents described the questionnaire as lengthy and time consuming.
Suggestions or other comments on the questionnaires	No comments

Quality control

Fieldwork monitoring	Fieldwork was monitored on a daily and weekly basis. Daily schedule of interviews was followed closely and individual interviewers were contacted/monitored via mobile phone and also in person for punctuality, interview length, etc. Interview times were difficult to arrange when one interviewer went away for a number of days for some interviews in the countryside. Reallocation of work among interviewers had to be done a lot. A few interviewers were trained a second time after quality issues were spotted. (For example, they had many "Do not know" or "Refused" answers after their first interview) and this improved in their later interviews after the second training. Some of them had problem with innovation questions. Recruiters were instructed to record detailed addresses for interviews since in Mongolia we have no clear address information to identify enterprises easily. Reaching out to the companies via addresses was one of the main difficulties for interviewers even after seemingly detailed written down address on the screening form. Finally, another problem was the supervisors having to be involved directly in recruitment as recruiters sometimes had problems persuading respondents and it took several people to persuade the respondent.
Data checking procedures	After the first 1-2 interviews of each individual interviewer, the interviewers met with the supervisors and there was a de-brief / checks to run through these first interviews. Data collected was checked on a weekly basis. Checks were done on routing, etc. and the supervisors made sure that the interview did not have many questions with refusal and "do not know" answers.
Number of respondents selected for back-checking	20
Selection procedures	Randomly selected
Who carried out back-checks?	Back checks were done by supervisors and staff from the call center.
Mode of contact	Telephone
Number of completed interviews back-checked	20

Number of non-responses back-checked	0
Results of alternative method of contacting non-respondents	N/A
Description of what was covered inthe back-checks	Company name, name of respondent, main activity of company, interview date.
Number of completed interviews that were rejected and why	15 interviews were rejected because of high non-response/ refusals. Some companies would not answer their phones after the survey when we wanted to clarify.

Database

Data entry program chosen	SPSS, WebADC
Comments on the data entry program	None
Comments on the data cleaning	None

Country situation

General aspects of economic, political or social situation of the country that could affect the results of the survey	During the fieldwork Mongolia went through many changes mainly due to political change. Mongolian government changed with a majority from the democratic party winning the election over a former communist party. The government went through structural changes as well as bureacratic system changes. Tendering and procurement regulations changed.
Relevant country events that occurred during fieldwork	There were 4 big holidays that affected the fieldwork. Lunar New Year holiday in February (unofficially) lasted more than three weeks and recruitment in the countryside was particularly difficult because of this holiday. Also end of January and whole February was difficult because of end of tax year. Naadam in July and vacation season starting in mid-June affected the fieldwork. Presidential election took place at the end of June. After the change in national government offices, the fieldwork had to stop for a while due to uncertainty in the provinces (because of changes in provincial government).
Other aspects	Many panel companies expressed that they participated in the survey before and they do not see any benefits for them / do not see any of the desired changes in policies. This is critical that they don't see it as useful. They said the changes in policy don't happen or even if there are changes, it does not bring benefit to them.

A.20 Montenegro

A.20.1.   Sampling structure and implementation

The first sampling frame was supplied by the World Bank and EBRD and consisted of enterprises interviewed in BEEPS IV. The World Bank and EBRD required that attempts should be made to re-interview establishments responding to the BEEPS IV survey where they were within the selected geographical regions and met eligibility criteria. That sample is referred to as the Panel. The source of the second sample frame was the datafile from the Central Registry of Commerical Subject and Bureau van Dijk's Orbis.

The quality of the frame was assessed at the onset of the project. The frame proved to be useful though it showed positive rates of non-eligibility, repetition, non-existent units, etc. These problems are typical of establishment surveys, but given the impact these inaccuracies may have on the results, adjustments were needed when computing the appropriate weights for individual observations. The percentage of confirmed non-eligible units as a proportion of the total number of contacts to complete the survey was 9.7% (24 out of 247 establishments).

Regional stratification was defined in 3 regions. These regions are Centre and South, Coast, and North. Table below shows the municipalies in each of these three regions.

Grouping used for stratification purposes in BEEPS V (municipalities in brackets)
North: Plevlja, Plužine, Bijelo Polje, Žabljak, Šavnik, Mojkovac
Centre and South: Nikšić, Danilovgrad, Podgorica, Kolašin, Andrijevica, Plav, Berane, Rožaje, Cetinje
Coast: Herceg Novi, Kotor, Tivat, Budva, Bar, Ulcinj

Fresh sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Centre and South	5-19	42	33	40	115
	20-99	13	5	9	27
	100+	8	6	11	25
	Total	**63**	**44**	**60**	**167**
Coast	5-19	20	40	37	97
	20-99	8	10	4	22
	100+	2	1	7	10
	Total	**30**	**51**	**48**	**129**
North	5-19	19	15	17	51
	20-99	6	5	6	17
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**25**	**20**	**23**	**68**
Grand Total		**118**	**115**	**131**	**364**

Source: Central Registry of Commercial Subjects, Tax Administration, Ministry of Finance (and Orbis data file)

Panel sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Centre and South	5-19				
	20-99				
	100+				
	Total				
Coast	5-19				
	20-99				
	100+				
	Total				
North	5-19				
	20-99				
	100+				
	Total				
Grand Total					

Source: BEEPS IV.

Original sample design

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Centre and South	5-19	17	14	15	46
	20-99	6	4	5	15
	100+	4	2	4	10
	Total	**27**	**20**	**24**	**71**
Coast	5-19	9	17	12	38
	20-99	3	4	3	10
	100+	1	1	3	5
	Total	**13**	**22**	**18**	**53**
North	5-19	7	6	6	19
	20-99	3	2	2	7
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**10**	**8**	**8**	**26**
Grand Total		**50**	**50**	**50**	**150**

A.20.2. Status codes

	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Complete interviews **(Total)**	150	96	54
Incomplete interviews	0	0	0
Elegible in process	0	0	0
Refusals	9	7	2
Out of target	24	15	9
Impossible to contact	8	8	0
Ineligible - coop.	0	0	0
Refusal to the Screener	56	37	19
Total	247	163	84

	ELIGIBLES	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Eligible	1.Elegible establishment (Correct name and address)	157	102	55
	2. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the new firm/establishment bought the original firm/establishment)	0	0	0
	3. Eligible establishment (Different name but same address - the firm/establishment changed its name)	1	0	1
	4. Elegible establishment (Wrong address - the firm/establishmen has changed address and the address could be found)	1	1	0
	16. Panel firm - now less than five employees	0	0	0
Ineligible	5. The establishment has less than 5 permanent full time employees	4	4	0
	6. The firm discontinued businesses	17	8	9
	7. Not a business: private household	0	0	0
	8. Ineligible activity: education, agriculture, finances, governments…	3	3	0
Unobtainable	91. No reply *(after having called in different days of the week and in different business hours)*	1	1	0
	92. Line out of order	0	0	0
	93. No tone	0	0	0
	94. Phone number does not exist	0	0	0
	10. Answering machine	0	0	0
	11. Fax line - data line	0	0	0
	12. Wrong address/ moved away and could not get the new references	7	7	0
	13. Refuses to answer the screener	56	37	19
	14. In process *(the establishment is being called/ is being contacted - previous to ask the screener)*	0	0	0
	151. Out of target - outside the covered regions, firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	152. Out of target - firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	153. Impossible to find	0	0	0
	Total	247	163	84

A.20.3. Survey and item non-response

The number of completed interviews per contacted establishment was 0.61. This number is the result of two factors: explicit refusals to participate in the survey, as reflected by the rate of rejection (which includes rejections of the screener and the main survey) and the quality of the sampling frame, as represented by the presence of ineligible units. The number of rejections per contact was 0.26.

A.20.4.   Local agency team involved in the study and its comments on the implementation

Local agency team involved in the survey

Local agency	Name: Ipsos Strategic Puls Country: Montenegro Activities since: 2002
Name of Project Manager	Cvetana Toskovic
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Vladimir Raicevic, Project Director Jelena Pejakovic, Project Assistant Tatjana Vukovic
Enumerators involved	Enumerators who only conducted the screener: 3 Enumerators who only conducted interviews: 18 Enumerators who did interviews and screener: 3
Other staff involved	Fieldwork Coordinators: 2 Editing: 2 Data Processing: 3 Note: Editing, data entry and data processing were conducted in Serbia

Sampling frame

Source	Datafile from Central Registry of Commercial Subjects (Tax Administration, Ministry of Finance) and Orbis data file.
Year of publication	Last updated June 2010
Comments on the quality of the sample frame	Two biggest problems with sampling frame were: 1. Lack of contact data - At some addresses we had only street name, there was no building number, and/or telephone number and/or email address; and this information couldn't be found online, or through other sources. 2. Sample frame was not regularly updated with information on the closure of companies so during recruitment a lot of businesses no longer existed
Year and organisation that conducted the last economic census	NA
Source	Datafile from Central Registry of Commercial Subjects (Tax Administration, Ministry of Finance) and Orbis data file.

Sample

Comments/problems on sectors and regions selected in the sample	No comments
Comments on the response rate	The response rate was closely monitored and is very good for a B2B survey, which is long and with top managers in many companies
Comments on the sample design	No comments

Fieldwork

Date of fieldwork	February 2013 – June 2013
Country	Montenegro
Number of completed interviews	150
Problems found during fieldwork	None.
Other observations	None.

Questionnaires

Problems for the understanding of questions (write question number)	No problems – interviewers were well prepared and had the questionnaire manual to refer to if needed
Problems found in the navigability of questionnaires (for example, skip patterns)	No problems due to using CAPI

Comments on questionnaire length	All respondents were previously informed of the questionnaire length, and survey background, so there were no major problems during interviewing.
Suggestions or other comments on the questionnaires	In some cases respondents were unwilling to search the data in their balance sheets and other firm documents. They preferred giving estimates, and calculating amounts they were asked about.

Quality control

Fieldwork monitoring	Since experienced interviewers were engaged with this survey, no major problems occurred. However, all interviewers were strictly monitored. The screening process was mostly done centrally, from the Podgorica office, so it could be closely controlled by the country manager. When the screeners were done locally, by regional supervisors, they were thoroughly checked to ensure all the procedures were followed.
	The questionnaire was programmed in CAPI, so there was no room for interviewers to make mistakes with routing. Recruiters paid special attention to filling A4b and S3 question properly.
	Since interviewers were allowed to skip a section (in the case they have to administer it with another respondent), in a few cases some sections were not filled in – in those cases the interviewer had to return to the field to collect the missing data. In a few cases, if only a couple of questions were missing, these were administered by calling the respondent by telephone.
Data checking procedures	Since the same CAPI program was used in another three countries in the region, as soon as first interviews were completed, all the checks were done in order to ensure there were no scripting/ routing errors. Later on, specially developed syntaxes for checking routing errors, assumption inconsistencies, and for detecting refusals share on certain questions, were applied at various stages of data collection, to ensure the quality of data. In that way, if any inconsistencies seemed to have occurred, they could be promptly checked with the respondent.
Number of respondents selected for back-checking	50
Selection procedures	Randomly selected respondents, for each interviewer
Who carried out back-checks?	Project manager, field manager and regional supervisors carried out back-checks
Mode of contact	Telephone and face to face
Number of completed interviews back-checked	40
Number of non-responses back-checked	10
Results of alternative method of contacting non-respondents	There were no positive results of alternative method of contacting non-respondents - these respondents confirmed their refusals.
Description of what was covered inthe back-checks	Company name Contact details Number of employees Industry sector Interview length Main product description Couple of the specific questions from the questionnaire, randomly selected.
Number of completed interviews that were rejected and why	None

Database

Data entry program chosen	SM-S (internally developed data entry program)
Comments on the data entry program	No comments
Comments on the data cleaning	There were no major issues during data cleaning, since CAPI program was

	strictly defined. In rare cases some data, that seemed odd, needed to be checked by calling respondents once again.

Country situation

General aspects of economic, political or social situation of the country that could affect the results of the survey	During last 6 months, significant political events have happened: Presidential elections where the governing coalition candidate won – unlike previous elections, this was a narrow win. Smaller coalition partner in government (SDP) started to oppose the major partner (DPS), initially by clear resistance to the presidential candidate. That led to the strengthening of opposition parties (Democratic front and SNP). Also, there have been a series of price increases of basic groceries; electricity price increased; fuel prices had 6 different increases in this period. Government adopted a decision to increase VAT from 17% to 19% (at the end of the fieldwork).
Relevant country events that occurred during fieldwork	Presidential elections were held on May 14th. Easter holidays were merged with Labor Day holidays, so officially there were 6 days off in period of 1st-6th May, but most of the firms/employees merged it with previous weekend, so it was 10 connected non-working days. Similarly, 21st May is National day, and again this holiday was merged with the weekend, so it made 5 non-working days in that period. Balance sheet revisions were done in March. During most of these days, it was impossible to do the interviewing.
Other aspects	No other comments

A.21   Poland

A.21.1.   Sampling structure and implementation

The first sampling frame was supplied by the World Bank and EBRD and consisted of enterprises interviewed in BEEPS IV. The World Bank and EBRD required that attempts should be made to re-interview establishments responding to the BEEPS IV survey where they were within the selected geographical regions and met eligibility criteria. That sample is referred to as the Panel. The second sample frame for Poland was the database of *HBI Hoppenstedt Bonnier*.

The quality of the frame was assessed at the onset of the project. The frame proved to be useful though it showed positive rates of non-eligibility, repetition, non-existent units, etc. These problems are typical of establishment surveys, but given the impact these inaccuracies may have on the results, adjustments were needed when computing the appropriate weights for individual observations. The percentage of confirmed non-eligible units as a proportion of the total number of contacts to complete the survey was 1.2% (111 out of 8976 establishments).

Regional stratification was defined in six regions. These regions are Central, Southern, Eastern, North-Western, South-Western, and Northern (NUTS-1).

NUTS-2 regions	Grouping used for stratification purposes in BEEPS V
Lodzkie	Central
Mazowieckie	
Malopolskie	Southern
Slaskie	
Lubelskie	Eastern
Podkarpackie	
Podlaskie	
Swietokrzyskie	
Lubuskie	North-western
Wielkopolskie	
Zachodniopomorskie	
Dolnoslaskie	South-western
Opolskie	
Kujawsko-Pomorskie	Northern
Pomorskie	
Warminsko-Mazurskie	

Fresh sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Central	5-19	383	492	867	1742
	20-99	327	238	282	847
	100+	114	109	78	301
	Total	**824**	**839**	**1227**	**2890**
Eastern	5-19	122	216	167	505
	20-99	126	80	63	269
	100+	83	40	32	155
	Total	**331**	**336**	**262**	**929**
Northern	5-19	173	231	266	670
	20-99	183	82	96	361
	100+	93	51	31	175
	Total	**449**	**364**	**393**	**1206**
North-western	5-19	235	385	492	1112
	20-99	234	156	171	561
	100+	161	61	28	250
	Total	**630**	**602**	**691**	**1923**
Southern	5-19	268	356	442	1066
	20-99	222	118	159	499
	100+	111	61	62	234
	Total	**601**	**535**	**663**	**1799**
South-western	5-19	136	230	204	570
	20-99	170	140	91	401
	100+	90	36	30	156
	Total	**396**	**406**	**325**	**1127**
Grand Total		**3231**	**3082**	**3561**	**9874**

Source: HBI database 2013

Panel sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Central	5-19	6	0	8	14
	20-99	8	1	4	13
	100+	5	1	3	9
	Total	**19**	**2**	**15**	**36**
Eastern	5-19	3	0	6	9
	20-99	2	0	2	4
	100+	2	1	4	7
	Total	**7**	**1**	**12**	**20**
Northern	5-19	4	1	3	8
	20-99	5	0	2	7
	100+	4	1	1	6
	Total	**13**	**2**	**6**	**21**
North-western	5-19	5	0	0	5
	20-99	2	0	5	7
	100+	4	0	2	6
	Total	**11**	**0**	**7**	**18**
Southern	5-19	2	1	0	3
	20-99	4	1	4	9
	100+	4	1	4	9
	Total	**10**	**3**	**8**	**21**
South-western	5-19	3	0	0	3
	20-99	1	0	2	3
	100+	2	1	2	5
	Total	**6**	**1**	**4**	**11**
Grand Total		**66**	**9**	**52**	**127**

Source: BEEPS IV.

Original sample design

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Central	5-19	21	25	38	84
	20-99	16	12	15	43
	100+	7	6	4	17
	Total	44	43	57	144
Eastern	5-19	8	13	11	32
	20-99	8	7	4	19
	100+	5	5	2	12
	Total	21	25	17	63
Northern	5-19	11	14	16	41
	20-99	11	8	6	25
	100+	6	5	2	13
	Total	28	27	24	79
North-western	5-19	13	17	20	50
	20-99	13	9	8	30
	100+	7	5	2	14
	Total	33	31	30	94
Southern	5-19	15	20	24	59
	20-99	13	9	10	32
	100+	7	5	4	16
	Total	35	34	38	107
South-western	5-19	8	10	9	27
	20-99	7	6	3	16
	100+	4	4	2	10
	Total	19	20	14	53
Grand Total		180	180	180	540

A.21.2.   Status codes

	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Complete interviews **(Total)**	542	525	17
Incomplete interviews	0	0	0
Elegible in process	3	3	0
Refusals	25	20	5
Out of target	111	111	0
Impossible to contact	951	921	30
Ineligible - coop.	8	7	1
Refusal to the Screener	7336	7270	66
Total	8976	8857	119

	ELIGIBLES			
Eligible	1.Elegible establishment (Correct name and address)	566	545	21
	2. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the new firm/establishment bought the original firm/establishment)	1	1	0
	3. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the firm/establishment changed its name)	1	1	0
	4. Elegible establishment (Wrong address - the firm/establishmen has changed address and the address could be found)	2	1	1
	16. Panel firm - now less than five employees	0	0	0
Ineligible	5. The establishment has less than 5 permanent full time employees	49	49	0
	6. The firm discontinued businesses	35	35	0
	7. Not a business: private household	5	5	0
	8. Ineligible activity: education, agriculture, finances, governments…	22	22	0
Unobtainable	91. No reply *(after having called in different days of the week and in different business hours)*	638	622	16
	92. Line out of order	28	27	1
	93. No tone	35	34	1
	94. Phone number does not exist	58	54	4
	10. Answering machine	153	145	8
	11. Fax line - data line	23	23	0
	12. Wrong address/ moved away and could not get the new references	16	16	0
	13. Refuses to answer the screener	7336	7270	66
	14. In process *(the establishment is being called/ is being contacted - previous to ask the screener)*	0	0	0
	151. Out of target - outside the covered regions, firm moved abroad	8	7	1
	152. Out of target - firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	153. Impossible to find	0	0	0
	Total	8976	8857	119

A.21.3.   Survey and item non-response

The number of completed interviews per contacted establishment was 0.06. This number is the result of two factors: explicit refusals to participate in the survey, as reflected by the rate of rejection (which includes rejections of the screener and the main survey) and the quality of the sampling frame, as represented by the presence of ineligible units. The number of rejections per contact was 0.82.

A.21.4.   Local agency team involved in the study and its comments on the implementation

Local agency team involved in the survey

Local agency	Name: Ipsos sp. z o.o. Country: Poland Membership of international organisation: - Activities since: 1991
Name of Project Manager	Paweł Jazukiewicz
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Krzysztof Chmielewski, Project Director Sławomir Mieczkowski, Field Manager Robert Chechłacz, Person responsible for data management/upload
Enumerators involved	Enumerators: 93 Recruiters: 20 Recruitment took place locally and in the final phase of the survey started recruiting center in our CATI studio.
Other staff involved	Fieldwork Coordinators: 21 Editing: 2 Data Entry: Not applicable Data Processing: 2

Sampling frame

Characteristic of sample frame used	Sample was drawn from HBI data base of companies (Verlag Hoppenstedt and Bonnier AB) on December 7 2012. The sample was completed with additional records on July 30th 2013. The database is daily updated.
Source	Verlag Hoppenstedt and Bonnier AB
Year of publication	2013
Comments on the quality of the sample frame	HBI database is constantly updated. It is representative for the large and medium-sised companies and less mapped small businesses.
Year and organisation that conducted the last economic census	Q1 2012, Central Statistical Office, database is updated every quarter.
Other sources for companies statistics	-

Sample

Comments/problems on sectors and regions selected in the sample	The biggest problem in meeting the sample design occurred in the case of large and medium-sized retail companies. The sample contained fewer addresses for the retail sector than for other sectors. Moreover, the largest retail companies often refused participation in the research. In one of the regions - Lubuskie (NUTS 2) none of companies drawn came from the main city of the region which generally increased the problem of reaching companies.
Comments on the response rate	It is difficult to compare with rates in other surveys since the length of the interview is longer and the level and detail of data required from the respondents is more detailed than other b2b surveys.
Comments on the sample design	The preference order procedure was to force interviewers' high engagement in the recruitment of respondents. At the same time, in many cases it resulted in a very significant delay in moving on to the next preference address, eg. when interviewers were brushed off for several weeks while not explicitly receiving a refusal participate. Efficiency of fieldwork could be increased by allocating an interviewer a higher number of addresses at one time, for example up to 3 or at least 2.

Fieldwork

Date of fieldwork	February 2013 – November 2013
Country	Poland

Number of completed interviews	542
Problems found during fieldwork	The overwhelming majority of refusals took place before asking any recruitment questions. They resulted mainly from a general lack of time for such a long study. The study started at a very inconvenient time of the year, namely in February, when annual financial reports need to be completed. Interviewers were quite frequently brushed off for this particular reason. They were quite often told to come back at a more convenient time of the year. Moreover, it was also directly before the winter school break, which further reduced the availability of some respondents. On the other hand, not giving such contacts a final status meant the inability to move on to the next firm. The fact that company representatives were tired of the numerous invitations to participate in other studies and surveys constituted a significant difficulty in the recruitment process. Some respondents declared that they got such invitations every few days. However, in some cases they might have confused sales proposals with research invitations. According to interviewers respondents frequently questioned the purpose and value of research participation. Whereas research projects are presented as serving public interest and providing useful information about the business environment, respondents said that they make no contribution and are not useful for companies. Of key importance for overcoming this barrier, may be information activities aimed at presenting the results of previous research, possibly along with information on areas where it was used.
Other observations	-

Questionnaires

Problems for the understanding of questions (write question number)	Question number: a) D2 and K7-K9: On many occasions repondents viewed this and other financial questions as an invasion of privacy and refused to answer them claiming this information to be confidential. b) L1: "Number of permanent, full time employees" is usually interpreted by both interviewers and respondents to mean "Number of employees with an employment contract". There are several types of terms of employment and many companies employ full time workers without full or permanent contracts. Therefore the number reflected in L1 is often less than the number of workers actually employed by the company, sometimes to the point that it shows up as an inconsistency with information from the sampling frame (which usually includes all permanent employees, not excluding those who have no full contract).
Problems found in the navigability of questionnaires (for example, skip patterns)	-
Comments on questionnaire length	We believe that it is worth ensuring that the average duration of an interview, its most extended variant, is less than 45 minutes. If an interview is longer, another visit is often necessary, which negatively impacts business respondents' readiness to co-operate in research. During recruitment the respondents first asked about the duration of the interview. The interviewers, who provided a true answer and said that it would last for about an hour, and the respondents often refused as a result.
Suggestions or other comments on the questionnaires	NA

Quality control

Fieldwork monitoring	Fieldwork efficiency was monitored continually with progress reporting. Number of appointments and conducted interviews was monitored for each coordination region (of which there are 18). Weekly progress reporting was used to check how many companies were contacted and how many

	interviews conducted, and whether interviewers adhered to the proper preference order in contacting companies. In case of calls made out of preference order, local coordinators were contacted and urged to correct the fieldwork methodology.
	Companies reported as 'Unobtainable' were subject to particular scrutiny. Such companies' data in the database was carefully checked, so were other databases and websites. In the case of discrepancies available contacts were verified over the phone.
	Based on the incoming reports progress in individual regions was followed, taking into account the efficiency of individual interviewers, including the Number of completed interviews, appointments, and refusals. The least efficient interviewers were given special supervision by the coordinators.
	Duration of the interviews carried out by individual interviewers and the share of 'refusal'/ "DK" were monitored. Interviewers getting a high share of "DK" were appropriately instructed in order to reduce the percentage of such answers.
	It was checked whether attempts were systematically repeated until at least 10 contact attempts at different times of the day were made. Interviewers were not allocated any new company addresses until they realised the required number of contact attempts with 'non-contact outcome' companies.
	For regions performing poorly on rates of appointments eventually central CATI studio was used to contact companies and make appointments to boost response rates. Another approach to dealing with poorly performing regions was redirecting accomplished interviewers from overlapping or neighbouring regions.
Data checking procedures	Interviews were conducted by CAPI and a significant number of data checks were included in the script. Interviewers were immediately alerted by the script when the data they entered was incoherent. Each question was scripted in such a way that it could be skipped in case of refusal or inability to enter coherent data, however the interviewer had to provide an immediate written explanation as to the reason for skipping each question. This served both to discourage refusals and as a way to gather respondent feedback on the questionnaire. Central data checks were performed upon upload of first 5 interviews, then at 10%, 50% and 100%. SPSS data checks provided by Ipsos MORI were run for each batch of uploaded interviews. The output was then analysed and every error was checked and corrected manually by data processing specialists and researchers.
Number of respondents selected for back-checking	70
Selection procedures	Randomly selected
Who carried out back-checks?	The back-checks were conducted by the independent Quality Control Department.
Mode of contact	Telephone
Number of completed interviews back-checked	51
Number of non-responses back-checked	19
Results of alternative method of contacting non-respondents	Not applicable
Description of what was covered inthe back-checks	Questions asked in back checks: Verify Company name Main activity and main porduct The position of the respondent Number of employees For refusals - reason for refusal
Number of completed interviews that were rejected and why	Interviews were rejected for two reasons. 6 interviews were rejected for not being carried out in line with preference order, while another 2 interviews were rejected due to the high number of 'DK' answers.

Database

Data entry program chosen	NIPO CAPI script
Comments on the data entry program	Not applicable
Comments on the data cleaning	Please refer to Quality control → data checking procedures

Country situation

General aspects of economic, political or social situation of the country that could affect the results of the survey	2013 was the second year of significant economic slowdown in Poland, which was mainly driven by low domestic demand. However, during the year a slight, although very slow, improvement in the economic situation was recorded. The main factor supporting increased economic activity in Poland was the activity of Polish exporters. Their competitiveness was further helped by minimal pay rises. 2013 saw a loosening in the fiscal policy, which was made stricter as a response to public debt exceeding the cautionary threshold in previous years. At that time the economy was positively influenced by a clear decrease in the rate of inflation and a significant decrease in interest rates. 2013 brought a significant increase in the number of businesses closing-down, which predominantly concerned the SME sector. More detailed data shows that bankruptcies continue to largely affect construction companies. Many clothing and footwear wholesale operations also continued to go out of business.
Relevant country events that occurred during fieldwork	Apart from fixed holidays (Easter, 1 April) there were two long weekends in May (1-5.05 and 30.05-2.06) and one in August (15-18.08). The beginning of the fieldwork – February – coincided with the time when companies were preparing their financial statements for 2012.
Other aspects	-

A.22 Romania

A.22.1. Sampling structure and implementation

The first sampling frame was supplied by the World Bank and EBRD and consisted of enterprises interviewed in BEEPS IV. The World Bank and EBRD required that attempts should be made to re-interview establishments responding to the BEEPS IV survey where they were within the selected geographical regions and met eligibility criteria. That sample is referred to as the Panel. . The second sample frame used in Romania was the Trade Register of Romania. The full frame was not made available. Instead an extract was selected in Romania according to instructions from the Ipsos statistical team in London.

The quality of the frame was assessed at the onset of the project. The frame proved to be useful though it showed positive rates of non-eligibility, repetition, non-existent units, etc. These problems are typical of establishment surveys, but given the impact these inaccuracies may have on the results, adjustments were needed when computing the appropriate weights for individual observations. The percentage of confirmed non-eligible units as a proportion of the total number of contacts to complete the survey was 8.4% (391 out of 4662 establishments).

Regional stratification was defined in eight regions. These regions are Nord-Est, Sud-Est, Sud-Muntenia, Vest, Nord-Vest, Bucuresti-Ilfov, Sud-Vest Oltenia, and Centru (NUTS-2).

Fresh sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Bucuresti-Ilfov	5-19	233	504	429	1166
	20-99	159	229	250	638
	100+	82	54	73	209
	Total	**474**	**787**	**752**	**2013**
Centru	5-19	202	201	188	591
	20-99	167	71	63	301
	100+	79	17	24	120
	Total	**448**	**289**	**275**	**1012**
Nord-Est	5-19	122	285	132	539
	20-99	119	76	78	273
	100+	52	6	44	102
	Total	**293**	**367**	**254**	**914**
Nord-Vest	5-19	187	213	190	590
	20-99	117	60	64	241
	100+	78	15	22	115
	Total	**382**	**288**	**276**	**946**
Sud-Est	5-19	105	272	217	594
	20-99	88	48	86	222
	100+	56	16	43	115
	Total	**249**	**336**	**346**	**931**
Sud-Muntenia	5-19	141	302	207	650
	20-99	85	64	52	201
	100+	97	8	12	117
	Total	**323**	**374**	**271**	**968**
Sud-Vest Oltenia	5-19	79	133	152	364
	20-99	54	39	69	162
	100+	38	9	26	73
	Total	**171**	**181**	**247**	**599**
Vest	5-19	90	170	174	434
	20-99	86	36	78	200
	100+	38	8	26	72
	Total	**214**	**214**	**278**	**706**
Grand Total		**2554**	**2836**	**2699**	**8089**

Source: Trade Register of Romania

Panel sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Bucuresti-Ilfov	5-19	4	10	21	35
	20-99	8	13	20	41
	100+	0	14	18	32
	Total	**12**	**37**	**59**	**108**
Centru	5-19	9	12	14	35
	20-99	7	5	7	19
	100+	5	4	4	13
	Total	**21**	**21**	**25**	**67**
Nord-Est	5-19	18	6	8	32
	20-99	7	8	8	23
	100+	4	3	1	8
	Total	**29**	**17**	**17**	**63**
Nord-Vest	5-19	9	11	12	32
	20-99	10	6	6	22
	100+	7	3	6	16
	Total	**26**	**20**	**24**	**70**
Sud-Est	5-19	7	6	7	20
	20-99	10	6	7	23
	100+	4	3	7	14
	Total	**21**	**15**	**21**	**57**
Sud-Muntenia	5-19	9	8	5	22
	20-99	1	8	4	13
	100+	4	3	2	9
	Total	**14**	**19**	**11**	**44**
Sud-Vest Oltenia	5-19	5	7	12	24
	20-99	2	5	1	8
	100+	4	3	3	10
	Total	**11**	**15**	**16**	**42**
Vest	5-19	8	10	7	25
	20-99	5	3	7	15
	100+	5	1	2	8
	Total	**18**	**14**	**16**	**48**
Grand Total		**152**	**158**	**189**	**499**

Source: BEEPS IV.

Original sample design

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Bucuresti-Ilfov	5-19	15	25	25	65
	20-99	10	11	14	35
	100+	5	5	6	16
	Total	**30**	**41**	**45**	**116**
Centru	5-19	15	15	12	42
	20-99	12	4	5	21
	100+	6	2	2	10
	Total	**33**	**21**	**19**	**73**
Nord-Est	5-19	10	18	10	38
	20-99	9	4	6	19
	100+	4	1	3	8
	Total	**23**	**23**	**19**	**65**
Nord-Vest	5-19	14	15	14	43
	20-99	9	4	5	18
	100+	5	2	2	9
	Total	**28**	**21**	**21**	**70**
Sud-Est	5-19	8	17	15	40
	20-99	7	3	6	16
	100+	4	2	2	8
	Total	**19**	**22**	**23**	**64**
Sud-Muntenia	5-19	9	18	13	40
	20-99	6	4	4	14
	100+	5	1	1	7
	Total	**20**	**23**	**18**	**61**
Sud-Vest Oltenia	5-19	6	10	9	25
	20-99	4	3	5	12
	100+	3	1	1	5
	Total	**13**	**14**	**15**	**42**
Vest	5-19	7	12	12	31
	20-99	5	2	6	13
	100+	2	1	2	5
	Total	**14**	**15**	**20**	**49**
Grand Total		**180**	**180**	**180**	**540**

A.22.2.   Status codes

	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Complete interviews **(Total)**	540	443	97
Incomplete interviews	0	0	0
Elegible in process	1	0	1
Refusals	387	335	52
Out of target	391	345	46
Impossible to contact	1095	896	199
Ineligible - coop.	6	6	0
Refusal to the Screener	2242	2154	88
Total	4662	4179	483

	ELIGIBLES	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Eligible	1.Elegible establishment (Correct name and address)	901	773	128
	2. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the new firm/establishment bought the original firm/establishment)	2	1	1
	3. Eligible establishment (Different name but same address - the firm/establishment changed its name)	1	0	1
	4. Elegible establishment (Wrong address - the firm/establishmen has changed address and the address could be found)	14	4	10
	16. Panel firm - now less than five employees	10	0	10
Ineligible	5. The establishment has less than 5 permanent full time employees	129	129	0
	6. The firm discontinued businesses	133	102	31
	7. Not a business: private household	109	98	11
	8. Ineligible activity: education, agriculture, finances, governments…	20	16	4
Unobtainable	91. No reply *(after having called in different days of the week and in different business hours)*	1068	873	195
	92. Line out of order	0	0	0
	93. No tone	0	0	0
	94. Phone number does not exist	10	10	0
	10. Answering machine	1	1	0
	11. Fax line - data line	0	0	0
	12. Wrong address/ moved away and could not get the new references	16	12	4
	13. Refuses to answer the screener	2242	2154	88
	14. In process *(the establishment is being called/ is being contacted - previous to ask the screener)*	0	0	0
	151. Out of target - outside the covered regions, firm moved abroad	4	4	0
	152. Out of target - firm moved abroad	1	1	0
	153. Impossible to find	1	1	0
	Total	4662	4179	483

A.22.3.   Survey and item non-response

The number of completed interviews per contacted establishment was 0.12. This number is the result of two factors: explicit refusals to participate in the survey, as reflected by the rate of rejection (which includes rejections of the screener and the main survey) and the quality of the sampling frame, as represented by the presence of ineligible units. The number of rejections per contact was 0.56.

A.22.4.   Local agency team involved in the study and its comments on the implementation

Local agency team involved in the survey

Local agency	Name: IMAS Marketing & Sondaje Country: Romania Membership of international organisation: ESOMAR Activities since: 1992
Name of Project Manager	Oana Spanu
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Catalina Sarpe, Project Director Gabriela Cirnu, Field Manager
Enumerators involved	Enumerators: 103 Recruiters: 23
Other staff involved	Fieldwork Coordinators: 52 Editing: 3 Data Entry: 5 Data Processing: 2

Sampling frame

Characteristic of sample frame used	Fresh sample of 80,639 establishments bought from Borg Design (listafirme.ro) and selected by IMAS based on the instructions provided by WB and EBRD; data from National Trade Register was also used for sample extraction.
Source	National Trade Register
Year of publication	2012
Comments on the quality of the sample frame	- Some enterprises did not fit their forms of ownership and number of employees; - Contact information belonged to a person/firm that submitted the annual tax report (counsellor, accountant, etc.); - Correspondence between NACE rev.2 and ISIC 3.1 was incomplete and it generated several differences between the designed sample and the observed one; for example, there are NACE sectors that are eligible according the description and to ISIC rev.4 classification but that seem to be not eligible according to ISIC 3.1
Year and organisation that conducted the last economic census	National Institute of Statistics, 2011, data updated each year
Other sources for companies statistics	No comments

Sample

Comments/problems on sectors and regions selected in the sample	- the companies from Southern area and Bucharest were the hardest to persuade to take part in the survey; - respondents do not believe in confidentiality and even if the interviewer provides them with evidence to support the confidentiality and anonymity, they are still afraid of saying too much
Comments on the response rate	None
Comments on the sample design	- sample design with three preferences that could only be accessed under specific conditions did have an impact on the progress; it took a lot of time to get in touch with potential respondents with preference one and during that period preferences two and three cannot be contacted

Fieldwork

Date of fieldwork	December 2012 – October 2013
Country	Romania
Number of completed interviews	540
Problems found during fieldwork	- low response rate, in general the BEEPS target was hard to reach;

	- the contact process was time consuming (10 attempts in different days), and it took multiple attempts afterwards to secure the interview; - in bigger companies interviewers had problems reaching a potential respondent as they were not allowed to talk to the manager; they had to discuss everything with the assistant or the person at the reception desk; sometimes the receptionist/secretary simply refused to put the recruiter through to top manager and stated that the manager did not have time to take part in the survey; - some of the respondents rescheduled the interview and then they could not be reached again to rearrange the interview (didn't answer the phone, didn't respect the meeting times and dates)
Other observations	No comments

Questionnaires

Problems for the understanding of questions (write question number)	Question number: a) D1a1, D1a2: difficult to indicate main product especially when company produces several products b) A4b: inexact correspondence between NACE and ISIC c) A7a: confusing for the some of the respondents who do not make a clear difference between establishment and branch
Problems found in the navigability of questionnaires (for example, skip patterns)	None
Comments on questionnaire length	The questionnaire is very long and it contains questions that require detailed information. The duration of the interview was one of the main reasons for refusal.
Suggestions or other comments on the questionnaires	None

Quality control

Fieldwork monitoring	The screening took place at the head office so recruiters were continuously monitored by CATI supervisors. Interviewers had days when refusals were greater than response rates so they worked to shift patterns to keep them motivated. Two recruiters quit after three months of fieldwork because of the low response rate. Regional coordinators checked the screeners when they put together the progress report. If they found incomplete information they talked directly to the recruiters. Interview appointments were also set at head office. Field interviewers had to call after the interview to confirm its status e.g. completion, completed during one visit, assess respondent's reaction etc.
Data checking procedures	Using the questionnaire and the syntaxes provided by IPSOS to check the data after entry.
Number of respondents selected for back-checking	139
Selection procedures	Selected from all regions, for all interviewers. Some were indicated by DP.
Who carried out back-checks?	A separate department - Quality and Control Department - conducts all back-checks.
Mode of contact	Telephone
Number of completed interviews back-checked	125
Number of non-responses back-checked	14
Results of alternative method of contacting non-respondents	Not applicable
Description of what was covered	Questions asked in back checks -

inthe back-checks	Verify Company name
	Number of employees
	Main activity
	Verify respondent's position in the firm
	Date of the interview
	If the interview was conducted in more than one visit
	Recovery of missing data signaled by the data processing staff
	Confirmation on various soft assumptions
Number of completed interviews that were rejected and why	NA

Database

Data entry program chosen	SPSS Data Entry, WebADC
Comments on the data entry program	None
Comments on the data cleaning	None

Country situation

General aspects of economic, political or social situation of the country that could affect the results of the survey	Around 30% of all companies have been closed in the last 3-4 years; a lot of Romanian small and medium size companies to do not update their addresses, phone no. etc. if they move to another location; a lot of companies have externalised accounting and financial management and the managers/owners do not know, purely and simply, NACE code, accounting figures; the disappearance of terrestrial phone lines etc.
Relevant country events that occurred during fieldwork	Christmas and Easter (May 5th) holidays, end of fiscal year 2012 (March-April 2013), official period for leaves/holidays in August.
Other aspects	None

A.23 Serbia

A.23.1. Sampling structure and implementation

The first sampling frame was supplied by the World Bank and EBRD and consisted of enterprises interviewed in BEEPS IV. The World Bank and EBRD required that attempts should be made to re-interview establishments responding to the BEEPS IV survey where they were within the selected geographical regions and met eligibility criteria. That sample is referred to as the Panel. The second frame used in Serbia was the Serbian Business Registers Agency.

The quality of the frame was assessed at the onset of the project. The frame proved to be useful though it showed positive rates of non-eligibility, repetition, non-existent units, etc. These problems are typical of establishment surveys, but given the impact these inaccuracies may have on the results, adjustments were needed when computing the appropriate weights for individual observations. The percentage of confirmed non-eligible units as a proportion of the total number of contacts to complete the survey was 8.7% (73 out of 836 establishments).

Regional stratification was defined in four regions. These regions are City of Belgrade, Southern and Eastern Serbia, Vojvodina, and Šumadija and Western Serbia. Table below shows the districts and municipalies in each of these four regions, as well as correspondence with NUTS-2 regions.

District	Municipality	Official statistical regions (NUTS-2) – Grouping to be used for stratification purposes in BEEPS V
City of Belgrade	Barajevo, Čukarica, Grocka, Lazarevac, Mladenovac, Novi Beograd, Obrenoovac, Palilula, Rakovica, Savski venac, Sopot, Stari Grad, Voždovac, Vračar, Zemun, Zvezdara	City of Belgrade
Bor	Bor, Kladovo, Majdanpek, Negotin	Southern and Eastern Serbia
Braničevo	Golubac, Kučevo, Malo Crniće, Petrovac, Požarevac, Veliko Gradište, Žabari, Žagubica	
Podunavlje	Smederevo, Smederevska Palanka, Velika Plana	
Zaječar	Boljevac, Knjaževac, Sokobanja, Zaječar	
Jablanica	Bojnik, Crna Trava, Lebane, Leskovac, Medveđa, Vlasotince	
Nišava	Aleksinac, Doljevac, Gadžin Han, Merošina, Niš, Niš-Crveni Krst, Niška Banja, Niš-Medijana, Niš-Palilula, Niš-Pantelej, Ražanj, Svrljig	
Pčinja	Bosilegrad, Bujanovac, Preševo, Surdulica, Trgovište, Vladičin Han, Vranje	
Pirot	Babušnica, Bela Palanka, Dimitrovgrad, Pirot	
Toplica	Blace, Kuršumlija, Prokuplje, Žitorađa	
Central Banat	Nova Crnja, Novi Bečej, Sečanj, Žitište, Zrenjanin	Vojvodina
North Bačka	Bačka Topola, Mali Iđoš, Subotica	
North Banat	Ada, Čoka, Kanjiža, Kikinda, Novi Kneževac, Senta	
South Bačka	Bač, Bačka Palanka, Bački Petrovac, Bečej, Beočin, Novi Sad, Srbobran, Sremski Karlovci, Temerin, Titel, Vrbas, Žabalj	
South Banat	Alibunar, Bela Crkva, Kovačica, Kovin, Opovo, Pančevo, Plandište, Vršac	
Srem	Inđija, Irig, Pećinci, Ruma, Sremska Mitrovica, Stara Pazova, Šid	
West Bačka	Apatin, Kula, Ođzaci, Sombor	
Kolubara	Lajkovac, Ljig, Mionica, Osečina, Ub, Valjevo	Šumadija and Western Serbia
Mačva	Bogatić, Koceljeva, Krupanj, Ljubovija, Loznica, Mali Zvornik, Šabac, Vladimirci	
Zlatibor	Arilje, Bajina Bašta, Čajetina, Kosjerić, Nova Varoš, Požega, Priboj, Prijepolje, Sjenica, Užice	
Moravica	Čačak, Gornji Milanovac, Ivanjica, Lučani	
Pomoravlje	Ćuprija, Despotovac, Paraćin, Rekovac, Jagodina, Svilajnac	
Rasina	Aleksandrovac, Brus, Ćićevac, Kruševac, Trstenik, Varvarin	
Raška	Kraljevo, Novi Pazar, Raška, Tutin, Vrnjačka Banja	
Šumadija	Aranđelovac, Batočina, Knić, Kragujevac, Lapovo, Rača, Topola	

Fresh sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
City of Belgrade	5-19	163	153	148	464
	20-99	70	100	122	292
	100+	22	38	9	69
	Total	**255**	**291**	**279**	**825**
Southern and Eastern Serbia	5-19	97	94	155	346
	20-99	37	30	34	101
	100+	11	10	17	38
	Total	**145**	**134**	**206**	**485**
Šumadija and Western Serbia	5-19	171	198	170	539
	20-99	90	47	47	184
	100+	28	7	14	49
	Total	**289**	**152**	**231**	**672**
Vojvodina	5-19	169	109	163	441
	20-99	80	37	66	183
	100+	33	14	16	63
	Total	**282**	**160**	**245**	**687**
Grand Total		**971**	**737**	**961**	**2669**

Source: Serbian Business Registers Agency

Panel sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
City of Belgrade	5-19	17	9	32	58
	20-99	11	9	13	33
	100+	5	6	18	29
	Total	**33**	**24**	**63**	**120**
Southern and Eastern Serbia	5-19	11	5	7	23
	20-99	8	2	2	12
	100+	7	1	1	9
	Total	**26**	**8**	**10**	**44**
Šumadija and Western Serbia	5-19	9	10	10	29
	20-99	9	5	7	21
	100+	8	1	4	13
	Total	**26**	**16**	**21**	**62**
Vojvodina	5-19	11	8	17	36
	20-99	10	4	6	20
	100+	3	3	2	8
	Total	**24**	**15**	**25**	**64**
Grand Total		**109**	**63**	**119**	**291**

Source: BEEPS IV.

Original sample design

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
City of Belgrade	5-19	20	18	20	58
	20-99	9	15	15	39
	100+	3	13	3	19
	Total	**32**	**45**	**38**	**115**
Southern and Eastern Serbia	5-19	12	11	18	41
	20-99	5	8	4	17
	100+	2	3	2	7
	Total	**19**	**22**	**24**	**65**
Šumadija and Western Serbia	5-19	20	12	20	52
	20-99	11	9	6	26
	100+	4	2	2	8
	Total	**35**	**23**	**28**	**86**
Vojvodina	5-19	20	13	20	53
	20-99	10	8	8	26
	100+	4	8	2	14
	Total	**34**	**29**	**30**	**93**
Grand Total		**120**	**120**	**120**	**360**

A.23.2.   Status codes

	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Complete interviews **(Total)**	360	240	120
Incomplete interviews	0	0	0
Elegible in process	0	0	0
Refusals	37	22	15
Out of target	73	48	25
Impossible to contact	40	29	11
Ineligible - coop.	0	0	0
Refusal to the Screener	326	238	88
Total	836	577	259

	ELIGIBLES	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Eligible	1.Elegible establishment (Correct name and address)	358	245	113
	2. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the new firm/establishment bought the original firm/establishment)	1	0	1
	3. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the firm/establishment changed its name)	3	2	1
	4. Elegible establishment (Wrong address - the firm/establishmen has changed address and the address could be found)	21	15	6
	16. Panel firm - now less than five employees	14	0	14
Ineligible	5. The establishment has less than 5 permanent full time employees	15	15	0
	6. The firm discontinued businesses	48	26	22
	7. Not a business: private household	0	0	0
	8. Ineligible activity: education, agriculture, finances, governments…	10	7	3
Unobtainable	91. No reply *(after having called in different days of the week and in different business hours)*	4	3	1
	92. Line out of order	0	0	0
	93. No tone	0	0	0
	94. Phone number does not exist	0	0	0
	10. Answering machine	0	0	0
	11. Fax line - data line	0	0	0
	12. Wrong address/ moved away and could not get the new references	36	26	10
	13. Refuses to answer the screener	326	238	88
	14. In process *(the establishment is being called/ is being contacted - previous to ask the screener)*	0	0	0
	151. Out of target - outside the covered regions, firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	152. Out of target - firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	153. Impossible to find	0	0	0
	Total	836	577	259

A.23.3.   Survey and item non-response

The number of completed interviews per contacted establishment was 0.43. This number is the result of two factors: explicit refusals to participate in the survey, as reflected by the rate of rejection (which includes rejections of the screener and the main survey) and the quality of the sampling frame, as represented by the presence of ineligible units. The number of rejections per contact was 0.43.

A.23.4. Local agency team involved in the study and its comments on the implementation

Local agency team involved in the survey

Local agency	Name: Ipsos Strategic Marketing Country: Serbia Membership of international organisation: Activities since: 1992
Name of Project Manager	Jelena Jakic
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Predrag Kurcubic, Project Director Tatjana Jovanov, Field Manager Tatjana Vukovic, Person responsible for data management/upload
Enumerators involved	Enumerators: 28 Recruiters: 6
Other staff involved	Fieldwork Coordinators: 9 Editing: 3 Data Entry: N/A Data Processing: 3

Sampling frame

Characteristic of sample frame used	Balance sheets 2011 data base
Source	Serbian Business Registers Agency
Year of publication	2011
Comments on the quality of the sample frame	Sample frame was satisfying.
Year and organisation that conducted the last economic census	N/A

Sample

Comments/problems on sectors and regions selected in the sample	There were no problems with sectors or regions selected in the sample.
Comments on the response rate	The response rate was monitored. At the end, is was satisfying, keeping in mind this was a business survey, with a long questionnaire for top management.
Comments on the sample design	It was achievable.

Fieldwork

Date of fieldwork	January 2013 – August 2013
Country	Serbia
Number of completed interviews	360
Problems found during fieldwork	The main reason for the refusal was the fear of the respondents that their data will be revealed to public administration.
Other observations	No comments

Questionnaires

Problems for the understanding of questions (write question number)	There were no problems with understanding questions.
Problems found in the navigability of questionnaires (for example, skip patterns)	There were no problems with navigability of questionnaires, since CAPI was used.
Comments on questionnaire length	All respondents were previously informed of the questionnaire length, so there were no major problems during interviewing.
Suggestions or other comments on the questionnaires	In some cases respondents were unwilling to search the data in their balance sheets and other firm documents. They preferred giving estimates,

	and calculating amounts they were asked about.

Quality control

Fieldwork monitoring	Experienced interviewers were used on this project so no major problems were expected. However, all interviewers were strictly monitored. There were no problems with the screening process. The screener questionnaire was CAPI programmed so there was no room for interviewers to make a mistake here. Recruiters paid special attention to the completion of a4b. There were a couple of instances where question responses were missing. To complete these questions the respondent was contacted via the phone.
Data checking procedures	The same CAPI program was used in another three countries in the region. As soon as the first interviews were completed all of the checks were done to ensure that there were no scripting/routing errors. To continue to ensure the quality of the data special syntaxes were developed for checking routing errors, assumption inconsistencies and for detecting a high percentage of refusals on certain questions. These checks were applied at various stages throughout the data collection period. This meant that inconsistencies could be promptly checked with the respondent.
Number of respondents selected for back-checking	170
Selection procedures	Randomy selected respondents, for each interviewer.
Who carried out back-checks?	Project manager, field manager and regional supervisors carried out back-checks.
Mode of contact	Telephone and face to face
Number of completed interviews back-checked	125
Number of non-responses back-checked	50
Results of alternative method of contacting non-respondents	N/A
Description of what was covered inthe back-checks	Questions asked in back checks - Company name Respondent name Number of employees Main activity of the firm Length of interview Length of innovation module Location of the interview Were all sections covered
Number of completed interviews that were rejected and why	No interviewers were rejected.

Database

Data entry program chosen	SM-S (internaly developed data entry program) - in this case used for CAPI.
Comments on the data entry program	Everything was working properly.
Comments on the data cleaning	There were no major issues during data cleaning, since CAPI program was strictly defined. In rare cases some responses that seemed odd needed to be checked by calling respondents once again.

Country situation

General aspects of economic, political or social situation of the country that could affect the results of the survey	Since last wave of BEEPS, the economic situation in the country has changed. Consequences of economic crises, which started in 2009, are still visible. Actually, economy still hasn't returned to the figures achieved in 2008. Unemployment rate is significantly higher. After elections in May 2012, and the biggest opposition party won and the

	Government completely changed. Also, President of the country changed. At the end of 2012, owners of some of the biggest companies in Serbia were arrested, due to financial malpractice and corruption.
Relevant country events that occurred during fieldwork	Submitting of the financial reports (balance sheets) on the previous fiscal year happened at the beginning of March, so interviewing in the period preceding that was almost impossible. At the beginning of May, Labor Day and Easter holidays were connected, so firms didn't work from 1st may to 6th May. Holiday season that happened during second half of July and whole August, also slowed down interviewing.
Other aspects	NA

A.24   Slovak Republic

A.24.1.   Sampling structure and implementation

The first sampling frame was supplied by the World Bank and EBRD and consisted of enterprises interviewed in BEEPS IV. The World Bank and EBRD required that attempts should be made to re-interview establishments responding to the BEEPS IV survey where they were within the selected geographical regions and met eligibility criteria. That sample is referred to as the Panel. The source of the second sample frame was the Albertina company database for the Slovak Republic, from January 2012.

The quality of the frame was assessed at the onset of the project. The frame proved to be useful though it showed positive rates of non-eligibility, repetition, non-existent units, etc. These problems are typical of establishment surveys, but given the impact these inaccuracies may have on the results, adjustments were needed when computing the appropriate weights for individual observations. The percentage of confirmed non-eligible units as a proportion of the total number of contacts to complete the survey was 2.1% (42 out of 1954 establishments).

Regional stratification was defined in 4 regions. These regions are Bratislava, Západné Slovensko, Stredné Slovensko, and Východné Slovensko (NUTS-2).

NUTS-3 regions	Grouping used for stratification purposes in BEEPS V
Bratislavský	Bratislavsky kraj
Trnavský	Zapadne Slovensko
Trenčiansky	
Nitriansky	
Zilinský	Stredne Slovensko
Banskobystrický	
Prešovský	Vychodne Slovensko
Košický	

Fresh sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Bratislavsky kraj	5-19	137	319	374	830
	20-99	98	86	119	303
	100+	59	28	58	145
	Total	**294**	**433**	**551**	**1278**
Stredne Slovensko	5-19	199	236	256	691
	20-99	135	43	34	212
	100+	75	8	37	120
	Total	**409**	**287**	**327**	**1023**
Vychodne Slovensko	5-19	195	258	272	725
	20-99	119	54	34	207
	100+	78	5	36	119
	Total	**392**	**317**	**342**	**1051**
Zapadne Slovensko	5-19	336	360	396	1092
	20-99	211	76	96	383
	100+	116	7	35	158
	Total	**663**	**443**	**527**	**1633**
Grand Total		**1758**	**1480**	**1747**	**4985**

Source: Albertina

Panel sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Bratislavsky kraj	5-19	3	1	6	10
	20-99	2	0	1	3
	100+	1	3	2	6
	Total	**6**	**4**	**9**	**19**
Stredne Slovensko	5-19	1	4	4	9
	20-99	5	0	6	11
	100+	5	1	3	9
	Total	**11**	**5**	**13**	**29**
Vychodne Slovensko	5-19	5	2	8	15
	20-99	1	1	6	8
	100+	2	2	4	8
	Total	**8**	**5**	**18**	**31**
Zapadne Slovensko	5-19	4	0	4	8
	20-99	9	1	4	14
	100+	4	2	5	11
	Total	**17**	**3**	**13**	**33**
Grand Total		**42**	**17**	**53**	**112**

Source: BEEPS IV.

Original sample design

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Bratislavsky kraj	5-19	7	16	19	42
	20-99	5	6	6	17
	100+	3	4	3	10
	Total	**15**	**26**	**28**	**69**
Stredne Slovensko	5-19	17	18	20	55
	20-99	11	6	5	22
	100+	6	2	2	10
	Total	**34**	**26**	**27**	**87**
Vychodne Slovensko	5-19	10	12	13	35
	20-99	7	5	2	14
	100+	4	1	2	7
	Total	**21**	**18**	**17**	**56**
Zapadne Slovensko	5-19	10	13	14	37
	20-99	6	6	2	14
	100+	4	1	2	7
	Total	**20**	**20**	**18**	**58**
Grand Total		**90**	**90**	**90**	**270**

A.24.2. Status codes

	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Complete interviews **(Total)**	276	264	12
Incomplete interviews	0	0	0
Elegible in process	24	23	1
Refusals	49	48	1
Out of target	42	40	2
Impossible to contact	503	486	17
Ineligible - coop.	1	1	0
Refusal to the Screener	1059	985	74
Total	1954	1847	107

	ELIGIBLES			
Eligible	1.Elegible establishment (Correct name and address)	322	309	13
	2. Eligible establishment (Different name but same address - the new firm/establishment bought the original firm/establishment)	0	0	0
	3. Eligible establishment (Different name but same address - the firm/establishment changed its name)	7	7	0
	4. Eligible establishment (Wrong address - the firm/establishmen has changed address and the address could be found)	20	19	1
	16. Panel firm - now less than five employees	0	0	0
Ineligible	5. The establishment has less than 5 permanent full time employees	15	15	0
	6. The firm discontinued businesses	13	13	0
	7. Not a business: private household	14	12	2
	8. Ineligible activity: education, agriculture, finances, governments…	0	0	0
Unobtainable	91. No reply *(after having called in different days of the week and in different business hours)*	355	343	12
	92. Line out of order	3	3	0
	93. No tone	1	1	0
	94. Phone number does not exist	125	120	5
	10. Answering machine	12	12	0
	11. Fax line - data line	6	6	0
	12. Wrong address/ moved away and could not get the new references	1	1	0
	13. Refuses to answer the screener	1059	985	74
	14. In process *(the establishment is being called/ is being contacted - previous to ask the screener)*	10	7	3
	151. Out of target - outside the covered regions, firm moved abroad	1	1	0
	152. Out of target - firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	153. Impossible to find	0	0	0
	Total	1964	1854	110

A.24.3. Survey and item non-response

The number of completed interviews per contacted establishment was 0.14. This number is the result of two factors: explicit refusals to participate in the survey, as reflected by the rate of rejection (which includes rejections of the screener and the main survey) and the quality of the sampling frame, as represented by the presence of ineligible units. The number of rejections per contact was 0.57.

A.24.4. Local agency team involved in the study and its comments on the implementation

Local agency team involved in the survey

Local agency 1	Ipsos Tambor, SRO
Name of Project Manager	Barbora Kasparkova
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Marketa Zampachova (Account Manager), Arnost Janecek (Account Director)
Enumerators involved	56
Other staff involved	-

Local agency 2	Median, SRO
Name of Project Manager	Jan Farkac
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Erika Kovarikova (Head of Research), Jindrich Bardon (fieldwork manager)
Enumerators involved	26
Other staff involved	-

Local agency 3	ACRC, SRO
Name of Project Manager	Michal Imre
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Andrea Kmetkova (Project Director)
Enumerators involved	92
Other staff involved	-

Sampling frame

Characteristic of sample frame used	Business register
Source	Albertina
Year of publication	2012
Comments on the quality of the sample frame	Many of the telephone contacts were out of date, it was necessary to search for new ones for the companies in the frame and still many were unreachable
Year and organisation that conducted the last economic census	NA

Sample

Comments/problems on sectors and regions selected in the sample	No sector-specific issues
Comments on the response rate	The response rate was relatively low; company managers rarely have time to complete an interview of this length without incentives
Comments on the sample design	

Fieldwork

Date of fieldwork	January 2013 – March 2014
Country	Slovakia
Number of completed interviews	276 (183 ACRC, 54 Tambor, 39 Median)
Problems found during fieldwork	There was a high refusal rate mostly because of the length and unincentivised nature of the interview, and the elite targets. This made recruitment very hard and led to some refusals after the screener too. A general distrust to surveys and institutions in Slovakia was also a factor.
Other observations	

Questionnaires

Problems for the understanding of	None

questions (write question number)	
Problems found in the navigability of questionnaires (for example, skip patterns)	None
Comments on questionnaire length	Too long for the target audience
Suggestions or other comments on the questionnaires	Reducing the length would have a significant and positive impact on the response rate

Quality control

Fieldwork monitoring	Fieldwork was monitored throughout in order to submit weekly progress reports. Recruitment was also monitored on an ongoing basis by CATI supervisors. Interviewers were being called if they were unable to complete recruited interviews within two weeks, and some contacts were reassigned to other interviewers. We chose the most experienced interviewers so there were no major issues.
Data checking procedures	The data was thoroughly checked after first few interviews, to ensure the quality of the script. We then uploaded part of the data to be sure we correctly transformed it to the datamap.
Number of respondents selected for back-checking	123
Selection procedures	Random selection
Who carried out back-checks?	CATI interviewers (not those who conducted the screener).
Mode of contact	Telephone
Number of completed interviews back-checked	123
Number of non-responses back-checked	0
Results of alternative method of contacting non-respondents	NA
Description of what was covered inthe back-checks	Verify company name, respondent position, number of employees, main product details and approximate interview length.
Number of completed interviews that were rejected and why	0

Database

Data entry program chosen	Proprietary software
Comments on the data entry program	
Comments on the data cleaning	

Country situation

General aspects of economic, political or social situation of the country that could affect the results of the survey	The country was experiencing economic and political turmoil during fieldwork, which may have made businesses more reticent to participate.
Relevant country events that occurred during fieldwork	The summer and Christmas holidays were a great setback for the interviewing, rarely anyone wanted to participate during these periods.
Other aspects	-

A.25   Slovenia

A.25.1.   Sampling structure and implementation

The first sampling frame was supplied by the World Bank and EBRD and consisted of enterprises interviewed in BEEPS IV. The World Bank and EBRD required that attempts should be made to re-

interview establishments responding to the BEEPS IV survey where they were within the selected geographical regions and met eligibility criteria. That sample is referred to as the Panel. The source of the second sample frame was the business register frm BIZI.

The quality of the frame was assessed at the onset of the project. The frame proved to be useful though it showed positive rates of non-eligibility, repetition, non-existent units, etc. These problems are typical of establishment surveys, but given the impact these inaccuracies may have on the results, adjustments were needed when computing the appropriate weights for individual observations. The percentage of confirmed non-eligible units as a proportion of the total number of contacts to complete the survey was 19.6% (208 out of 1060 establishments).

Regional stratification was defined in 2 regions. These regions are Vzhodna Slovenija and Zahodna Slovenija (NUTS-2).

NUTS-3 regions	Grouping used for stratification purposes in BEEPS V
Pomurska	Vzhodna Slovenija
Podravska	
Koroska	
Savinjska	
Zasavska	
Spodnjeposavska	
Jugovzhodna Slovenija	
Notranjsko-kraska	
Osrednjeslovenska	Zahodna Slovenija
Gorenjska	
Goriska	
Obalno-kraska	

Fresh sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Vzhodna Slovenija	5-19	280	221	356	857
	20-99	136	60	87	283
	100+	73	17	36	126
	Total	**489**	**298**	**479**	**1266**
Zahodna Slovenija	5-19	302	227	342	871
	20-99	115	82	143	340
	100+	69	37	36	142
	Total	**486**	**346**	**521**	**1353**
Grand Total		**975**	**644**	**1000**	**2619**

Source: 2012 – Business register from Bizi.com

Panel sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Vzhodna Slovenija	5-19	20	19	8	47
	20-99	20	10	21	51
	100+	23	1	12	36
	Total	**63**	**30**	**41**	**134**
Zahodna Slovenija	5-19	10	13	21	44
	20-99	17	3	13	33
	100+	15	8	12	35
	Total	**42**	**24**	**46**	**112**
Grand Total		**105**	**54**	**87**	**246**

Source: BEEPS IV.

Original sample design

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Vzhodna Slovenija	5-19	25	27	25	77
	20-99	15	12	13	40
	100+	8	5	3	16
	Total	**48**	**44**	**41**	**133**
Zahodna Slovenija	5-19	25	26	26	77
	20-99	11	13	18	42
	100+	6	7	5	18
	Total	**42**	**46**	**49**	**137**
Grand Total		**90**	**90**	**90**	**270**

A.25.2. Status codes

	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Complete interviews **(Total)**	270	175	95
Incomplete interviews	0	0	0
Elegible in process	0	0	0
Refusals	18	14	4
Out of target	208	183	25
Impossible to contact	108	83	25
Ineligible - coop.	2	2	0
Refusal to the Screener	454	393	61
Total	1060	850	210

	ELIGIBLES			
Eligible	1.Elegible establishment (Correct name and address)	253	182	71
Eligible	2. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the new firm/establishment bought the original firm/establishment)	3	0	3
Eligible	3. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the firm/establishment changed its name)	11	0	11
Eligible	4. Elegible establishment (Wrong address - the firm/establishmen has changed address and the address could be found)	21	7	14
Eligible	16. Panel firm - now less than five employees	0	0	0
Ineligible	5. The establishment has less than 5 permanent full time employees	99	99	0
Ineligible	6. The firm discontinued businesses	100	75	25
Ineligible	7. Not a business: private household	9	9	0
Ineligible	8. Ineligible activity: education, agriculture, finances, governments…	0	0	0
Unobtainable	91. No reply *(after having called in different days of the week and in different business hours)*	64	48	16
Unobtainable	92. Line out of order	0	0	0
Unobtainable	93. No tone	0	0	0
Unobtainable	94. Phone number does not exist	2	2	0
Unobtainable	10. Answering machine	0	0	0
Unobtainable	11. Fax line - data line	0	0	0
Unobtainable	12. Wrong address/ moved away and could not get the new references	42	33	9
	13. Refuses to answer the screener	454	393	61
	14. In process *(the establishment is being called/ is being contacted - previous to ask the screener)*	1	1	0
	151. Out of target - outside the covered regions, firm moved abroad	1	1	0
	152. Out of target - firm moved abroad	1	1	0
	153. Impossible to find	0	0	0
	Total	1061	851	210

A.25.3. Survey and item non-response

The number of completed interviews per contacted establishment was 0.25. This number is the result of two factors: explicit refusals to participate in the survey, as reflected by the rate of rejection (which includes rejections of the screener and the main survey) and the quality of the sampling frame, as represented by the presence of ineligible units. The number of rejections per contact was 0.45.

A.25.4. Local agency team involved in the study and its comments on the implementation

Local agency team involved in the survey

Local agency	Name: Ipsos Slovenia Country: Slovenia Membership of international organisation: ESOMAR Activities since: 2006
Name of Project Manager	Mojca Klenovšek
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Lenka Hrastar, Project Director Gregor Jankovič, Field Manager
Enumerators involved	Enumerators: 19 Recruiters: 3
Other staff involved	Fieldwork Coordinators: 1 Editing: 5 Data Entry: 0 (CAPI – done by enumerators) Data Processing: 3

Sampling frame

Characteristic of sample frame used	Business register from Bizi.com (contacts and main business information for 130.000 companies).
Source	BIZI
Year of publication	
Comments on the quality of the sample frame	Medium quality; 2 main issues: a lot of companies do not have data regarding the number of employees; limited characteristics for downloading (only 7 different characteristics, for example: name, address, telephone number etc).
Year and organisation that conducted the last economic census	Not applicable - Each company has to register in The Agency of the Republic of Slovenia for Public Legal Records and Related Services (AJPES), which is an indispensable primary source of official public and other information on business entities in Slovenia.

Sample

Comments/problems on sectors and regions selected in the sample	No problems.
Comments on the response rate	Lower than expected. Influence of economic crises, because businessmen are fed up with research and are under the impressions that surveys do not help them; during the crisis most (special small) firms decreased number of empoyees, therefore directors of such firms have much more work.
Comments on the sample design	/
Other comments	/

Fieldwork

Date of fieldwork	March 2013 – September 2013
Country	Slovenia
Number of completed interviews	270
Problems found during fieldwork	Timing of FW: in the time of the national and world economic crisis, holidays, and length of the interview particularly the manufacturing questionnaire.
Other observations	/

Questionnaires

Problems for the understanding of questions (write question number)	Question number: a) C7: number per month --> prefer number per year b) Q46D,K15A: confidential data c) K15C: sensitive data due to general economic crisis d) J6, J7: Nobody wanted to expose these situations are happening in

	general (e.g. if there is a corruption in their industry - for example J12); so they really do not want to deal with particular % e) L8: our respondents did not know the exact duration on average for all temporally employed workers f) N2: usually they do not measure individually cost for electricity
Problems found in the navigability of questionnaires (for example, skip patterns)	Not applicable. There were no problems at all. CAPI methodology and therefore there were no problems with skips.
Comments on questionnaire length	The manufacturing interview was too long
Suggestions or other comments on the questionnaires	Innovation module (additional questionnaire): lack of respondent's knowledge about different type of innovations, too detailed questions about product innovation. Where applicable, better measure would be PER YEAR (not per month). Many respondents would be very happy to fulfill numerical parts as web survey and other parts CAPI face-to-face.

Quality control

Fieldwork monitoring	**On recruitment level** Every two days we monitored the progress of each piece of sample. We monitored contacting of firms (number of days needed to get contact/to make screener, number of calls, reasons for refusals, were the calls made in different hours/days) - all of this information was recorded in our internal Excel spreadsheet. We also monitored if the information from the sample matched with the answer from the screener (addresses, sector, number of employees, region). **On interviewing level** We monitored every interviewer individually. We considered the length of interviews and spoke with approximately 50 % of interviewers directly after the interviews in order to gather initial feedback (e.g. how respondent's behaved, did they gather data from documentation, issues with the questionnaire).
Data checking procedures	Data was checked after the first four interviews. We wanted to ensure there were no problems with filters or any other programming issues (especially ensuring that the information from the screening questions was included in the data alongside resposnes to the main questionnaire). As fieldwork progressed we checked data on an ongoing basis, placing particular emphasis on the innovation module (definitions of innovations).
Number of respondents selected for back-checking	105
Selection procedures	Randomly selected interviews and interviews with suspiciously short interview lengths.
Who carried out back-checks?	Data control team at our F/W department and project manager if necessary.
Mode of contact	Telephone
Number of completed interviews back-checked	70
Number of non-responses back-checked	35
Results of alternative method of contacting non-respondents	
Description of what was covered inthe back-checks	Questions asked in back checks: - the subject of questionnaires - who (exactly) were a respondent (also name of firm, the address) - what is the main sector in which company is working and main product/service - the duration of an interview - do they have any innovation (if yes, what kind of innovation do they have)

Number of completed interviews that were rejected and why	Two interviews were excluded from the base because they were incorrectly completed (too many missing responses and/or DK).

Database

Data entry program chosen	SM-S (internally developed data entry program)
Comments on the data entry program	No comments
Comments on the data cleaning	No comments

Country situation

General aspects of economic, political or social situation of the country that could affect the results of the survey	We assume that general economic crisis increase refusals.
Relevant country events that occurred during fieldwork	Holidays; at the end of June bigger companies had board meetings; 1st of July Slovenien government introduced new tax policy (higher VAT).
Other aspects	/

A.26 Tajikistan

A.26.1.   Sampling structure and implementation

The first sampling frame was supplied by the World Bank and EBRD and consisted of enterprises interviewed in BEEPS IV. The World Bank and EBRD required that attempts should be made to re-interview establishments responding to the BEEPS IV survey where they were within the selected geographical regions and met eligibility criteria. That sample is referred to as the Panel. The source of the second sample frame was the National Statistics Committee of Tajikistan (2012) and the third sample frame was The Business Registry of the Tax Committee (2011).

The quality of the frame was assessed at the onset of the project. The frame proved to be useful though it showed positive rates of non-eligibility, repetition, non-existent units, etc. These problems are typical of establishment surveys, but given the impact these inaccuracies may have on the results, adjustments were needed when computing the appropriate weights for individual observations. The percentage of confirmed non-eligible units as a proportion of the total number of contacts to complete the survey was 5.4% (85 out of 1585 establishments).

Regional stratification was defined in 4 regions (oblasts). These regions are Capital (Dushanbe), Sogdiskaya oblast, Khatlonskaya oblast, and RRP (Region of Republican Subordination).

Official provinces	Grouping used for stratification purposes in BEEPS V
Sughd	Sughd
RRP – Region of Republican Subordination	RRP – Region of Republican Subordination
	Dushanbe
Khatlon	Khatlon
Gorno-Badakhshan Autonomous Province	Not covered – only 3% of population

Fresh sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Dushanbe	5-19	169	190	511	870
	20-99	84	37	187	308
	100+	32	6	70	108
	Total	**195**	**86**	**295**	**576**
Khatlon	5-19	112	60	188	360
	20-99	63	23	100	186
	100+	20	3	7	30
	Total	**195**	**86**	**295**	**576**
RRP – Region of Republican Subordination	5-19	58	49	144	251
	20-99	34	19	62	115
	100+	13	5	14	32
	Total	**105**	**73**	**220**	**398**
Sughd	5-19	185	68	226	479
	20-99	124	34	114	272
	100+	54	11	16	81
	Total	**363**	**113**	**356**	**832**
Grand Total		**948**	**505**	**1639**	**3092**

Source: The Statistical Committee of Tajikistan, 2012; The Business Registry of the Tax Committee, 2011

Panel sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Dushanbe	5-19	5	13	11	29
	20-99	9	1	16	26
	100+	12		4	16
	Total	**26**	**14**	**31**	**71**
Khatlon	5-19	7	9	10	26
	20-99	7	1	10	18
	100+	5		2	7
	Total	**19**	**10**	**22**	**51**
RRP – Region of Republican Subordination	5-19	16	15	18	49
	20-99	12	3	16	31
	100+	8		5	13
	Total	**36**	**18**	**39**	**93**
Sughd	5-19	15	11	18	44
	20-99	11	1	20	32
	100+	9	1	12	22
	Total	**35**	**13**	**50**	**98**
Grand Total		**116**	**55**	**142**	**313**

Source: BEEPS IV.

Original sample design

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Dushanbe	5-19	9	19	30	58
	20-99	3	12	7	22
	100+	0	4	2	6
	Total	**12**	**35**	**39**	**86**
Khatlon	5-19	15	15	19	49
	20-99	11	8	8	27
	100+	4	2	2	8
	Total	**30**	**25**	**29**	**84**
RRP – Region of Republican Subordination	5-19	7	13	4	26
	20-99	6	7	2	15
	100+	2	3	2	7
	Total	**15**	**23**	**8**	**46**
Sughd	5-19	8	12	7	27
	20-99	6	10	5	19
	100+	0	6	4	10
	Total	**14**	**28**	**15**	**57**
Grand Total		**70**	**111**	**92**	**274**

176

A.26.2.   Status codes

	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Complete interviews **(Total)**	359	324	35
Incomplete interviews	0	0	0
Elegible in process	50	43	7
Refusals	94	88	6
Out of target	85	75	10
Impossible to contact	955	856	99
Ineligible - coop.	1	1	0
Refusal to the Screener	41	37	4
Total	1585	1424	161

	ELIGIBLES	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Eligible	1.Elegible establishment (Correct name and address)	494	447	47
	2. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the new firm/establishment bought the original firm/establishment)	0	0	0
	3. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the firm/establishment changed its name)	7	6	1
	4. Elegible establishment (Wrong address - the firm/establishmen has changed address and the address could be found)	2	2	0
	16. Panel firm - now less than five employees	0	0	0
Ineligible	5. The establishment has less than 5 permanent full time employees	5	3	2
	6. The firm discontinued businesses	36	32	4
	7. Not a business: private household	0	0	0
	8. Ineligible activity: education, agriculture, finances, governments…	44	40	4
Unobtainable	91. No reply *(after having called in different days of the week and in different business hours)*	651	597	54
	92. Line out of order	53	51	2
	93. No tone	47	45	2
	94. Phone number does not exist	81	51	30
	10. Answering machine	12	11	1
	11. Fax line - data line	11	11	0
	12. Wrong address/ moved away and could not get the new references	100	90	10
	13. Refuses to answer the screener	41	37	4
	14. In process *(the establishment is being called/ is being contacted - previous to ask the screener)*	35	35	0
	151. Out of target - outside the covered regions, firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	152. Out of target - firm moved abroad	1	1	0
	153. Impossible to find	0	0	0
	Total	1620	1459	161

A.26.3.   Survey and item non-response

The number of completed interviews per contacted establishment was 0.23. This number is the result of two factors: explicit refusals to participate in the survey, as reflected by the rate of rejection (which includes rejections of the screener and the main survey) and the quality of the sampling frame, as represented by the presence of ineligible units. The number of rejections per contact was 0.09.

A.26.4.   Local agency team involved in the study and its comments on the implementation

Local agency team involved in the survey

Local agency	SIAR Research and Consulting Group
Name of Project Manager	Leyla Hajiyev
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Ashraf Hajiyev – Project Director Nigar Huseynzade – Assistant Project manager
Enumerators involved	35 interviewers 6 recruiters
Other staff involved	Data processing staff

Sampling frame

Characteristic of sample frame used	Database of State Statistics Committee of Tajijistan The Business Registry of the Tax Committee (2nd sample frame obtained during fieldwork)
Source	
Year of publication	2012, 2011
Comments on the quality of the sample frame	There were huge problems with the list. Many companies did not exist or went out of business years ago. Often the contact information was out of date. Therefore, the decision was made to obtain a new database of companies, new sampling frame was prepared, and though it was much better than the original database, although there were still problems with the quality. As the contact information of enterprises was poor quality, it was frequently necessary to visit the places directly for recruitment.
Year and organisation that conducted the last economic census	NA

Sample

Comments/problems on sectors and regions selected in the sample	No comments
Comments on the response rate	No comments
Comments on the sample design	No comments

Fieldwork

Date of fieldwork	February 2013 – April 2014
Country	Tajikistan
Number of completed interviews	359
Problems found during fieldwork	Some respondents did not want to provide real numbers about their turnover, which is why they refused to answer that question. This is especially seen in questions N6_1, N6_2. Lack of willingness to answer was also witnessed with respect to questions about court system and unofficial payments. Also they refused to tell the real number of employees working in the firm. The biggest problem during fieldwork was the sample, as it was old, most of the addresses and contact numbers did not exist or were changed. Quite frequently respondents had no time, interviewers had to wait and postpone the meetings quite frequently
Other observations	

Questionnaires

Problems for the understanding of questions (write question number)	B.8 – respondents had difficulty understanding the quality certification K.7 – respondents had difficulty with the term 'overdraft'
Problems found in the navigability of questionnaires (for example,	NA

skip patterns)	
Comments on questionnaire length	Questionnaire was long and it took a lot of time to answer the questions. Before the interview respondents were informed of the approximate duration of the interview, but still some of them were complained during the interview. Some respondents were busy and asked to wait or rescheduled the interview.
Suggestions or other comments on the questionnaires	It would be better if the questionnaire was written in less official language and if the questions were shorter.

Quality control

Fieldwork monitoring	Questionnaires were reviewed to check they were complete and also monitored for high refusal rates. Additional interviewers were trained and four interviewers were retrained.
Data checking procedures	
Number of respondents selected for back-checking	160
Selection procedures	Random selection among each interviewer's questionnaires
Who carried out back-checks?	The back-check was conducted by a special quality control team and also supervisors
Mode of contact	Telephone
Number of completed interviews back-checked	120
Number of non-responses back-checked	18
Results of alternative method of contacting non-respondents	NA
Description of what was covered inthe back-checks	The name of the entity, sector, key products/services, length of interview, usage of show-cards, etc.
Number of completed interviews that were rejected and why	16

Database

Data entry program chosen	SPSS, WebADC
Comments on the data entry program	NA
Comments on the data cleaning	NA

Country situation

General aspects of economic, political or social situation of the country that could affect the results of the survey	NA
Relevant country events that occurred during fieldwork	National holidays: New Year (January 1), International Women Day (March,8), Novruz (March 20-21), International Labour Day (May 1), Victory Day (May, 9), National Unity Day (June 27), Ramadan (August, 8-9), Independence Day (September 9), Gurban Bayram (October 15-16), Constitution Day (November 6), National Recociliation Day (November 9)
Other aspects	

A.27 Turkey

A.27.1.   Sampling structure and implementation

Two sample frame sources were used. The first sample frame was supplied by the World Bank and EBRD and consisted of enterprises interviewed in BEEPS 2009. The World Bank and EBRD required that attempts should be made to re-interview establishments responding to the BEEPS 2009 survey where

they were within the selected geographical regions and met eligibility criteria. That sample is referred to as the Panel. The second sample frame was provided by the Turkish Statistical Institute (TUIK).

The quality of the frame was assessed at the onset of the project. The frame proved to be useful though it showed positive rates of non-eligibility, repetition, non-existent units, etc. These problems are typical of establishment surveys, but given the impact these inaccuracies may have on the results, adjustments were needed when computing the appropriate weights for individual observations. The percentage of confirmed non-eligible units as a proportion of the total number of contacts to complete the survey was 3.0% (339 out of 11141 establishments).

Regional stratification was defined in 6 regions. These regions are Marmara, Aegean, Mediterranean, Central Anatolia, Black Sea and Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia.

NUTS-3 provinces	NUTS-2 regions	NUTS-1 regions	Grouping to be used for stratification purposes in BEEPS V
Istanbul	Istanbul	Istanbul	Marmara
Tekirdag, Edirne, Kirklareli	Tekirdag	Bati Marmara	
Baleksir, Canakkale	Balikesir		
Bursa, Eskisehir, Bilecik	Bursa	Dogu Marmara	
Kocaeli, Sakarya, Duzce, Bolu, Yalova	Kocaeli		
Izmir	Izmir	Ege	Aegean
Aydin, Denizli, Mugla	Aydin		
Manisa, Afyon, Kutahya, Usak	Manisa		
Antalya, Isparta, Burdur	Antalya	Akdeniz	Mediterranean
Adana, Icel	Adana		
Hatay, Kahramanmaras, Osmaniye	Hatay		
Ankara	Ankara	Bati Anadolu	Central Anatolia
Konya, Karaman	Konya		
Kirikkale, Aksaray, Nigde, Nevsehir, Kirsehir	Kirikkale	Orta Anadolu	
Kayseri, Sivas, Yozgat	Kayseri		
Zonguldak, Karabuk, Bartin	Zonguldak	Bati Karadeniz	Black Sea
Kastamonu, Cankiri, Sinop	Kastamonu		
Samsun, Tokat, Corum, Amasya	Samsun		
Trabzon, Ordu, Giresun, Rize, Artvin, Gumushane	Trabzon	Dogu Karadeniz	
Erzurum, Erzincan, Bayburt	Erzurum	Kuzeydogu Anadolu	Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia
Agri, Kars, Igdir, Ardahan	Agri		
Malatya, Elazig, Bingol, Tunceli	Malatya	Ortadogu Anadolu	
Van, Mus, Bitlis, Hakkari	Van		
Gaziantep, Adiyaman, Kilis	Gaziantep	Guneydogu Anadolu	
Sanliurfa, Diyarbakir	Sanliurfa		
Mardin, Batman, Sirnak, Siirt	Mardin		

Fresh sampling frame

Region	Employees	15	17	18	24	26	28	Retail	Other Manufacturing	Other Services	Grand Total
Aegean	5-19	180	198	180	180	180	198	360	216	432	2124
	20-99	162	162	162	79	162	144	36	72	36	1015
	100+	97	99	96	17	99	37	36	36	36	553
	Total	**439**	**459**	**438**	**276**	**441**	**379**	**432**	**324**	**504**	3692
Black Sea	5-19	180	42	118	23	162	144	162	72	36	939
	20-99	144	25	126	10	162	52	36	36	36	627
	100+	35	3	34		21	9	15	36	36	189
	Total	**359**	**70**	**278**	**33**	**345**	**205**	**213**	**144**	**108**	1755
Central Anatolia	5-19	180	113	144	180	162	216	324	288	450	2057
	20-99	144	52	126	42	162	162	36	90	36	850
	100+	65	21	26	5	46	54	36	36	36	325
	Total	**389**	**186**	**296**	**227**	**370**	**432**	**396**	**414**	**522**	3232
Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia	5-19	180	161	125	115	162	144	181	72	35	1175
	20-99	144	162	92	22	163	42	36	36	36	733
	100+	26	109	14	2	19	4	31	30	36	271
	Total	**350**	**432**	**231**	**139**	**344**	**190**	**248**	**138**	**107**	2179
Marmara	5-19	288	305	432	252	198	360	449	450	449	3183
	20-99	180	234	306	198	180	216	36	432	217	1999
	100+	145	162	162	71	138	162	36	54	37	967
	Total	**613**	**701**	**900**	**521**	**516**	**738**	**521**	**936**	**703**	6149
Mediterranean	5-19	180	144	126	95	162	162	252	126	144	1391
	20-99	144	133	86	37	160	141	36	36	36	809
	100+	24	72	36	7	30	24	36	36	36	301
	Total	**348**	**349**	**248**	**139**	**352**	**327**	**324**	**198**	**216**	2501
Grand Total		**2498**	**2197**	**2391**	**1335**	**2368**	**2271**	**2134**	**2154**	**2160**	**19508**

Source: TUIK 2012

Panel sampling frame

Region	Employees	15	17	18	24	26	28	Retail	Other Manufacturing	Other Services	Grand Total
Aegean	5-19	8	10	7	13	19		9	7	4	77
	20-99	11	12	16	12	21	2	4	6	3	87
	100+	8	20	11	4	3			3	1	50
	Total	**27**	**42**	**34**	**29**	**43**	**2**	**13**	**16**	**8**	214
Black Sea	5-19	4		3	3	3			2		15
	20-99	4	1	2	2	2			2	2	15
	100+	1				2			1		4
	Total	**9**	**1**	**5**	**5**	**7**			**5**	**1**	**34**
Central Anatolia	5-19	20	6	5	18	5		7	5	3	69
	20-99	11	3	8	9	7	3	3	4	1	49
	100+	13	3	2	2	3	1	1			25
	Total	**44**	**12**	**15**	**29**	**15**	**4**	**11**	**9**	**4**	103
Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia	5-19	10	5		4	5	1	1	7	7	40
	20-99	17	12	1	6	1		1	2	4	44
	100+	3	10	1	1	1			2	1	19
	Total	**30**	**27**	**2**	**11**	**7**	**1**	**2**	**11**	**12**	103
Marmara	5-19	16	23	17	28	21	1	9	11	16	142
	20-99	24	25	22	32	18		6	8	13	148
	100+	11	32	29	17	7		1	5	2	104
	Total	**51**	**80**	**68**	**77**	**46**	**1**	**16**	**24**	**31**	394
Mediterranean	5-19	5	7	16	11	7	6	3	9	7	71
	20-99	9	10	11	3	7	4	1	7	2	54
	100+	5	5	1	2				3		16
	Total	**19**	**22**	**28**	**16**	**14**	**10**	**4**	**19**	**9**	**141**
Grand Total		**180**	**184**	**152**	**167**	**132**	**18**	**46**	**84**	**66**	**1029**

Source: BEEPS IV.

Original sample design

Region	Employees	15	17	18	24	26	28	Retail	Other Manufacturing	Other Services	Grand Total
Aegean	5-19	10	11	10	10	10	11	20	12	24	118
	20-99	9	9	9	10	9	8	2	4	2	62
	100+	7	8	7	10	8	7	2	2	2	53
	Total	26	28	26	30	27	26	24	18	28	233
Black Sea	5-19	10	8	7	10	9	8	9	4	2	67
	20-99	8	8	7	10	9	7	2	2	2	55
	100+	7	3	7	0	8	7	2	2	2	38
	Total	25	19	21	20	26	22	13	8	6	160
Central Anatolia	5-19	10	8	8	10	9	12	18	16	25	116
	20-99	8	8	7	10	9	9	2	5	2	60
	100+	7	8	7	5	8	7	2	2	2	48
	Total	25	24	22	25	26	28	22	23	29	224
Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia	5-19	10	9	7	10	9	8	10	4	2	69
	20-99	8	9	7	10	9	7	2	2	2	56
	100+	7	8	6	2	8	4	2	2	2	41
	Total	25	26	20	22	26	19	14	8	6	166
Marmara	5-19	16	17	24	14	11	20	25	25	25	177
	20-99	10	13	17	11	10	12	2	24	12	111
	100+	8	9	9	11	8	9	2	3	2	61
	Total	34	39	50	36	29	41	29	52	39	349
Mediterranean	5-19	10	8	7	10	9	9	14	7	8	82
	20-99	8	8	7	10	9	8	2	2	2	56
	100+	7	8	7	7	8	7	2	2	2	50
	Total	25	24	21	27	26	24	18	11	12	188
Grand Total		**160**	**160**	**160**	**160**	**160**	**160**	**120**	**120**	**120**	**1320**

A.27.2.　　Status codes

	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Complete interviews **(Total)**	1363	1207	156
Incomplete interviews	145	131	14
Elegible in process	36	33	3
Refusals	756	540	216
Out of target	339	304	35
Impossible to contact	4907	4686	221
Ineligible - coop.	1035	1032	3
Refusal to the Screener	2560	2296	264
Total	11141	10229	912

	ELIGIBLES			
Eligible	1.Elegible establishment (Correct name and address)	1996	1674	322
	2. Eligible establishment (Different name but same address - the new firm/establishment bought the original firm/establishment)	13	12	1
	3. Eligible establishment (Different name but same address - the firm/establishment changed its name)	37	36	1
	4. Eligible establishment (Wrong address - the firm/establishmen has changed address and the address could be found)	254	189	65
	16. Panel firm - now less than five employees	0	0	0
Ineligible	5. The establishment has less than 5 permanent full time employees	56	54	2
	6. The firm discontinued businesses	154	128	26
	7. Not a business: private household	43	38	5
	8. Ineligible activity: education, agriculture, finances, governments…	86	84	2
Unobtainable	91. No reply *(after having called in different days of the week and in different business hours)*	782	668	114
	92. Line out of order	228	198	30
	93. No tone	649	605	44
	94. Phone number does not exist	2940	2933	7
	10. Answering machine	1	1	0
	11. Fax line - data line	42	39	3
	12. Wrong address/ moved away and could not get the new references	265	242	23
	13. Refuses to answer the screener	2560	2296	264
	14. In process *(the establishment is being called/ is being contacted - previous to ask the screener)*	3815	3735	80
	151. Out of target - outside the covered regions, firm moved abroad	1034	1032	2
	152. Out of target - firm moved abroad	1	0	1
	153. Impossible to find	0	0	0
	Total	14956	13964	992

A.27.3.　　Survey and item non-response

The number of completed interviews per contacted establishment was 0.12. Details on rejections rates, eligibility rates, and item non-response are available at the strata level. This report summarizes these numbers to alert researchers of these issues when using the data and when making inferences. The number of rejections per contact was 0.30.

A.27.4. Local agency team involved in the study and its comments on the implementation

Local agency team involved in the survey

Local agency 1	Ipsos Turkey
Name of Project Manager	Sema Pak Karaca
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Cana Kaya – Field manager Nihan Ozparlak – Senior specialist
Enumerators involved	35
Other staff involved	12 screener-only interviewers, 3 fieldwork supervisors, 3 data processing staff, 6 editing staff

Local agency 2	Yöntem Research and Consultancy
Name of Project Manager	Bahar TAD
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Sevim AKTULGA - Overall Project Dicrector Devrim Kavurgacı – Field Manager Şükrü Ordulu - Data Entry Manager
Enumerators involved	16
Other staff involved	4 recruiters, 2 fieldwork coordinators, 5 data editors, 5 data entry staff and 2 data processing staff

Sampling frame

Characteristic of sample frame used	Business frame from TUIK (Turkish Statistical Insitute), 2012
Source	TUIK
Year of publication	2012
Comments on the quality of the sample frame	Yontem: The sample was more difficult to work with than expected because to reach all respondents was a drawn-out process due to problems with obtaining accurate contact detail.
Year and organisation that conducted the last economic census	

Sample

Comments/problems on sectors and regions selected in the sample	None
Comments on the response rate	Respondents in the construction sector did not have detailed information. Additionally, it was difficult to reach respondents in Black Sea
Comments on the sample design	Number of completed interviews posed a problem; as did remote cities with fewer than 5 interviews

Fieldwork

Date of fieldwork	Ipsos Turkey: September 2012 – July 2014 Yontem: December 2013 to May 2014
Country	Turkey
Number of completed interviews	1363 (Ipsos Turkey: 1006, Yontem: 357)
Problems found during fieldwork	Ipsos Turkey: Length of interview caused many to refuse at the screener. Nationwide protests at the end of 2012 caused major disruption to fieldwork. Yontem: In the Black Sea region and some parts of Central Anatolia and the Eastern part of Turkey proved to be problematic regions for this research study. Sometimes, interviewers found that respondents were hesitant to answer the questions posed of them.
Other observations	

Questionnaires

Problems for the understanding of questions (write question number)	ECAo1b: Long question, difficult to understand ECAo4: Respondents were unable to provide detailed answers ECAo5: Respondents had difficulty understanding the question ECAo8: Difficult to understand what the question is asking D2: The most difficult question to understand in the survey Coin toss: Participants did not give this section great importance
Problems found in the navigability of questionnaires (for example, skip patterns)	
Comments on questionnaire length	Many respondents found the questionnaire overlong and boring
Suggestions or other comments on the questionnaires	Shortening the questionnaire and simplifying some questions would help with the overall flow and ease of administration

Quality control

Fieldwork monitoring	Yontem: Fieldwork generally ran smoothly from the point of view of interviewer recruitment and monitoring. No interviewers were dropped and the initial team that was trained provided sufficient capacity to complete fieldwork..
Data checking procedures	Ipsos Turkey: About 40% back checked Yontem: Minimum 10% back-checks
Number of respondents selected for back-checking	Ipsos Turkey: 400 Yontem: 80
Selection procedures	Respondents were randomly selected for back checks
Who carried out back-checks?	Ipsos Turkey: The field manager oversaw back checjs Yontem: A separate team of quality control CATI interviewers, who did not work on the main BEEPs survey, conducted the back-checks.
Mode of contact	Telephone
Number of completed interviews back-checked	35
Number of non-responses back-checked	45
Results of alternative method of contacting non-respondents	N/A
Description of what was covered inthe back-checks	Respondents verified • Company name • Number of Employes • Date firm registered • Details of main product • Length of interview • The method of interview (F2F OR Telephone)
Number of completed interviews that were rejected and why	Yontem: 0

Database

Data entry program chosen	Ipsos Turkey: Proprietory data entry programme Yontem: WebADC
Comments on the data entry program	None
Comments on the data cleaning	None

Country situation

General aspects of economic, political or social situation of the country that could affect the results of the survey	As fieldwork stretches over two years, it was affected by elections and national holidays (in particular the festival of Bayram, which covers two weeks a year). Widespread anti-government protests in 2012 also caused over a month's disruption to fieldwork and made participants less likely to take part.

Relevant country events that occurred during fieldwork	National and local elections, anti-government protests, Bayram.
Other aspects	

A.28 Ukraine

A.28.1. Sampling structure and implementation

The first sampling frame was supplied by the World Bank and EBRD and consisted of enterprises interviewed in BEEPS IV. The World Bank and EBRD required that attempts should be made to re-interview establishments responding to the BEEPS IV survey where they were within the selected geographical regions and met eligibility criteria. That sample is referred to as the Panel. The source of the second sample frame was the Business-Guide™: The Enterprises of Ukraine.

The quality of the frame was assessed at the onset of the project. The frame proved to be useful though it showed positive rates of non-eligibility, repetition, non-existent units, etc. These problems are typical of establishment surveys, but given the impact these inaccuracies may have on the results, adjustments were needed when computing the appropriate weights for individual observations. The percentage of confirmed non-eligible units as a proportion of the total number of contacts to complete the survey was 7.4% (265 out of 3577 establishments).

Regional stratification was defined in 5 regions. These regions are North, South, East, West and Kiev.

Oblast	Grouping used for stratification purposes in BEEPS V
Kyiv	Kyiv
Kyivska	
Dnipropetrovska	East
Donetska	
Kharkivska	
Luhanska	
Sumska	
Zaporizka	
Chernivetska	West
Ivano-Frankivska	
Khmelnytska	
Lvivska	
Rivnenska	
Ternopilska	
Volynska	
Zakarpatska	
Autonomous Republic of Crimea	South
Khersonska	
Mykolayivska	
Odeska	
Sevastopol	
Cherkaska	North
Chernihivska	
Kirovohradska	
Poltavska	
Vinnytska	
Zhytomyrska	

Fresh sampling frame

Region	Employees	15	18	26	29	Retail	Other Manufacturing	Other Services	Grand Total
East	5-19	179	103	138	327	250	242	262	1501
	20-99	170	69	83	237	97	110	73	839
	100+	104	0	48	108	45	90	91	486
	Total	**453**	**172**	**269**	**672**	**392**	**442**	**426**	**2826**
Kyiv	5-19	125	80	64	174	159	195	233	1030
	20-99	70	30	62	99	73	98	83	515
	100+	47	10	34	24	21	42	65	243
	Total	**242**	**120**	**160**	**297**	**253**	**335**	**381**	**1788**
North	5-19	71	36	64	98	79	70	74	492
	20-99	79	37	38	68	55	50	39	366
	100+	58	7	16	20	36	39	20	196
	Total	**208**	**80**	**118**	**186**	**170**	**159**	**133**	**1054**
South	5-19	101	32	56	71	155	77	44	536
	20-99	61	21	37	52	52	39	62	324
	100+	36	3	7	14	17	43	50	170
	Total	**198**	**56**	**100**	**137**	**224**	**159**	**156**	**1030**
West	5-19	103	96	58	73	161	107	69	667
	20-99	75	64	40	40	68	63	60	410
	100+	51	17	19	17	34	44	35	217
	Total	**229**	**177**	**117**	**130**	**263**	**214**	**164**	**1294**
Grand Total		**1330**	**605**	**764**	**1422**	**1302**	**1309**	**1260**	**7992**

Source: Business-Guide™. The Enterprises of Ukraine. (2012)

Panel sampling frame

Region	Employees	15	18	26	29	Retail	Other Manufacturing	Other Services	Grand Total
East	5-19	8	15	0	7	14	9	13	66
	20-99	9	8	0	11	10	10	23	71
	100+	6	0	0	5	3	6	5	25
	Total	**23**	**23**	**0**	**23**	**27**	**25**	**41**	**162**
Kyiv	5-19	14	15	0	7	9	8	17	70
	20-99	5	8	0	8	11	10	13	55
	100+	10	8	2	10	3	6	6	45
	Total	**29**	**31**	**2**	**25**	**23**	**24**	**36**	**170**
North	5-19	8	16	0	9	13	14	21	81
	20-99	10	8	1	6	1	10	8	44
	100+	2	4	0	8	2	8	4	28
	Total	**20**	**28**	**1**	**23**	**16**	**32**	**33**	**153**
South	5-19	10	17	4	12	9	7	14	73
	20-99	12	9	0	10	8	8	10	57
	100+	2	2	1	4	1	3	9	22
	Total	**24**	**28**	**5**	**26**	**18**	**18**	**33**	**152**
West	5-19	9	8	0	4	7	13	15	56
	20-99	8	11	2	7	4	9	12	53
	100+	10	5	0	1	3	4	1	24
	Total	**27**	**24**	**2**	**12**	**14**	**26**	**28**	**133**
Grand Total		**123**	**134**	**10**	**109**	**98**	**125**	**171**	**770**

Source: BEEPS IV.

Original sample design

Region	Employees	15	18	26	29	Retail	Other Manufacturing	Other Services	Grand Total
East	5-19	17	27	29	31	22	21	23	170
	20-99	17	16	16	22	9	10	8	98
	100+	10	0	9	11	4	8	8	50
	Total	**44**	**43**	**54**	**64**	**35**	**39**	**39**	**318**
Kyiv	5-19	17	20	13	19	14	17	21	121
	20-99	9	7	12	11	7	9	8	63
	100+	5	3	7	4	2	4	6	31
	Total	**31**	**30**	**32**	**34**	**23**	**30**	**35**	**215**
North	5-19	9	11	15	13	8	7	8	71
	20-99	11	11	7	8	5	5	4	51
	100+	8	2	3	3	4	4	2	26
	Total	**28**	**24**	**25**	**24**	**17**	**16**	**14**	**148**
South	5-19	13	12	13	9	14	7	5	73
	20-99	9	6	8	7	5	4	6	45
	100+	5	1	2	3	2	4	5	22
	Total	**27**	**19**	**23**	**19**	**21**	**15**	**16**	**140**
West	5-19	13	23	13	11	14	10	7	91
	20-99	9	17	9	5	6	6	6	58
	100+	8	4	4	3	4	4	3	30
	Total	**30**	**44**	**26**	**19**	**24**	**20**	**16**	**179**
Grand Total		**160**	**160**	**160**	**160**	**120**	**120**	**120**	**1000**

A.28.2. Status codes

	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Complete interviews **(Total)**	1003	811	192
Incomplete interviews	0	0	0
Elegible in process	4	2	2
Refusals	181	116	65
Out of target	265	216	49
Impossible to contact	1044	860	184
Ineligible - coop.	6	5	1
Refusal to the Screener	1074	906	168
Total	3577	2916	661

	ELIGIBLES			
Eligible	1.Elegible establishment (Correct name and address)	1124	885	239
	2. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the new firm/establishment bought the original firm/establishment)	18	13	5
	3. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the firm/establishment changed its name)	11	8	3
	4. Elegible establishment (Wrong address - the firm/establishmen has changed address and the address could be found)	35	23	12
	16. Panel firm - now less than five employees	0	0	0
Ineligible	5. The establishment has less than 5 permanent full time employees	9	9	0
	6. The firm discontinued businesses	185	150	35
	7. Not a business: private household	54	44	10
	8. Ineligible activity: education, agriculture, finances, governments…	17	13	4
Unobtainable	91. No reply *(after having called in different days of the week and in different business hours)*	567	452	115
	92. Line out of order	192	176	16
	93. No tone	28	20	8
	94. Phone number does not exist	90	74	16
	10. Answering machine	24	17	7
	11. Fax line - data line	10	9	1
	12. Wrong address/ moved away and could not get the new references	133	112	21
	13. Refuses to answer the screener	1074	906	168
	14. In process *(the establishment is being called/ is being contacted - previous to ask the screener)*	22	18	4
	151. Out of target - outside the covered regions, firm moved abroad	6	5	1
	152. Out of target - firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	153. Impossible to find	0	0	0
	Total	3599	2934	665

A.28.3. Survey and item non-response

The number of completed interviews per contacted establishment was 0.28. This number is the result of two factors: explicit refusals to participate in the survey, as reflected by the rate of rejection (which includes rejections of the screener and the main survey) and the quality of the sampling frame, as represented by the presence of ineligible units. The number of rejections per contact was 0.35.

A.28.4. Local agency team involved in the study and its comments on the implementation

Local agency team involved in the survey

Local agency	Name: Ipsos Ukraine Country: Ukraine Membership of international organisation: ESOMAR Activities since: 2002
Name of Project Manager	Anna Gryshyna
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Elena Babak, Project Director Denis Moiseenko, Field Manager Dmitriy Burov, Person responsible for data management/upload
Enumerators involved	Enumerators: - Recruiters: - BOTH: 73
Other staff involved	Fieldwork Coordinators: 17 Editing: Data Entry: 5 Data Processing: 2

Sampling frame

Characteristic of sample frame used	Business-Guide™. The Enterprises of Ukraine. Full database. Business register. 2012
Source	Business-Guide™. The Enterprises of Ukraine. Full database. Business register. 2012
Year of publication	2012
Comments on the quality of the sample frame	Many companies are registered but do not actually have any commercial activities.
Year and organisation that conducted the last economic census	-

Sample

Comments/problems on sectors and regions selected in the sample	There were difficulties in contacting big companies.
Comments on the response rate	No comments
Comments on the sample design	Random probability approach meant there was no flexibility which made it difficult to achieve interviews.

Fieldwork

Date of fieldwork	February 2013 – November 2013
Country	Ukraine
Number of completed interviews	1002
Problems found during fieldwork	There were many refusals due to the subject matter and the necessity to share financial information. Respondents also reported negative experiences with the previous round of BEEPS or other similar studies (there were some unplanned audits of the companies by authorities just after their participation in a previous wave).
Other observations	No comments

Questionnaires

Problems for the understanding of questions (write question number)	No comments
Problems found in the navigability of questionnaires (for example, skip patterns)	No comments

Comments on questionnaire length	The questionnaire was too long, and was not easy to finish it in one visit.
Suggestions or other comments on the questionnaires	No comments

Quality control

Fieldwork monitoring	30% of interviews were checked by the phone (for each interviewer). The following details were checked: company name, number of employees, main product, time of interview, interview duration.
Data checking procedures	-
Number of respondents selected for back-checking	300
Selection procedures	Randomly selected for each interviewer
Who carried out back-checks?	We have a separate team of quality control CATI interviewers, who did not work on the main BEEPs survey who conducted the back-checks.
Mode of contact	Telephone
Number of completed interviews back-checked	285
Number of non-responses back-checked	15
Results of alternative method of contacting non-respondents	No comments
Description of what was covered in the back-checks	Questions asked in back checks - Verify Company name Number of employees Details of main product Checked length of interview.
Number of completed interviews that were rejected and why	-

Database

Data entry program chosen	'DataEntry' tool (used by Ipsos Ukraine and Ipsos Russia)
Comments on the data entry program	No
Comments on the data cleaning	No

Country situation

General aspects of economic, political or social situation of the country that could affect the results of the survey	There were not any specific situations in Ukraine during the fieldwork period. But in general, the political and economic situation is unstable in Ukraine and it had its influence on the study.
Relevant country events that occurred during fieldwork	No comments
Other aspects	No

A.29 Uzbekistan

A.29.1. Sampling structure and implementation

The first sampling frame was supplied by the World Bank and EBRD and consisted of enterprises interviewed in BEEPS IV. The World Bank and EBRD required that attempts should be made to re-interview establishments responding to the BEEPS IV survey where they were within the selected geographical regions and met eligibility criteria. That sample is referred to as the Panel. The source of the second sample frame was the Uniform State Register of Enterprises and Organisations, published by the State Department of Statistics of the Republic of Uzbekistan.

The quality of the frame was assessed at the onset of the project. The frame proved to be useful though it showed positive rates of non-eligibility, repetition, non-existent units, etc. These problems are typical of establishment surveys, but given the impact these inaccuracies may have on the results, adjustments were needed when computing the appropriate weights for individual observations. The percentage of confirmed non-eligible units as a proportion of the total number of contacts to complete the survey was 7.9% (85 out of 1078 establishments).

Regional stratification was defined in 6 regions. These regions are Andizhanskaja, Ferganskaja, Kashkadarinskaja, Samarkandskaja, Tashkent and Tashkentskaya. Namangan was excluded later on in the fieldwork due to the heightened threat of terrorism and safety of interviewers. It was not possible to obtain sampling frames for the remaining provinces.

Province (viloyat)	Grouping used for stratification purposes in BEEPS V
Andijon	Andizhanskaja
Fargona	Ferganskaja
Qashkadaryo	Kashkadarinskaja
Samarqand	Samarkandskaja
Toshkent Shahri	Tashkent
Toshkent	Tashkentskaja
Jizzax	Not covered
Sidaryo	Not covered
Namangan	Not covered (had to be abandoned)
Buxoro	Not covered
Navoiy	Not covered
Surxondaryo	Not covered
Xorazm	Not covered
Qaraqalpaqstan Republikasi	Not covered

Fresh sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Andizhanskaja	5-19	18	18	12	48
	20-99	30	54	12	96
	100+	42	6	18	66
	Total	**90**	**78**	**42**	**210**
Ferganskaja	5-19	12	30	18	60
	20-99	36	59	30	125
	100+	44	1	24	69
	Total	**92**	**90**	**72**	**254**
Kashkadarinskaja	5-19	6	18	12	36
	20-99	12	27	24	63
	100+	24	2	36	62
	Total	**42**	**47**	**72**	**161**
Samarkandskaja		18	24	12	54
	5-19	24	42	12	78
		36	12	36	84
	20-99	**78**	**78**	**60**	**216**
		150	90	276	516
	100+	84	72	66	222
		54	37	42	133
	Total	**288**	**199**	**384**	**871**
Tashkent		12	42	18	72
	5-19	42	48	24	114
		60	5	48	113
	20-99	**114**	**95**	**90**	**299**
	100+	**704**	**587**	**720**	**2011**
	Total	18	18	12	48
Tashkentskaja	5-19	30	54	12	96
	20-99	42	6	18	66
	100+	**90**	**78**	**42**	**210**
	Total	12	30	18	60
Grand Total		36	59	30	125

Source: The Statistical Committee of Uzbekistan.

Panel sampling frame

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Andizhanskaja	5-19	0	0	0	0
	20-99	0	0	0	0
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Ferganskaja	5-19	0	0	0	0
	20-99	0	0	0	0
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Kashkadarinskaja	5-19	0	0	0	0
	20-99	0	0	0	0
	100+	0	0	0	0
	Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Samarkandskaja	5-19	17	12	12	41
	20-99	17	20	12	49
	100+	11	11	11	33
	Total	**45**	**43**	**35**	**123**
Tashkent	5-19	21	19	13	53
	20-99	13	15	13	41
	100+	7	11	13	31
	Total	**41**	**45**	**39**	**125**
Tashkentskaja	5-19	6	17	18	41
	20-99	16	10	11	37
	100+	13	3	11	27
	Total	**35**	**30**	**40**	**105**
Grand Total		**121**	**112**	**120**	**353**

Source: BEEPS IV.

Original sample design

Region	Employees	Manufacturing	Retail	Other Services	Grand Total
Andizhanskaja	5-19	3	3	2	8
	20-99	5	9	2	16
	100+	7	4	3	14
	Total	**15**	**16**	**7**	**38**
Ferganskaja	5-19	2	5	3	10
	20-99	6	10	5	21
	100+	9	1	4	14
	Total	**17**	**16**	**12**	**45**
Kashkadarinskaja	5-19	1	3	2	6
	20-99	2	7	4	13
	100+	5	1	6	12
	Total	**8**	**11**	**12**	**31**
Samarkandskaja	5-19	3	4	2	9
	20-99	4	7	2	13
	100+	6	8	6	20
	Total	**13**	**19**	**10**	**42**
Tashkent	5-19	25	15	46	86
	20-99	14	12	11	37
	100+	9	13	7	29
	Total	**48**	**40**	**64**	**152**
Tashkentskaja	5-19	2	7	3	12
	20-99	7	8	4	19
	100+	10	3	8	21
	Total	19	18	15	52
Grand Total		**120**	**120**	**120**	**360**

A.29.2. Status codes

	TOTAL	FRESH	PANEL
Complete interviews **(Total)**	390	250	140
Incomplete interviews	0	0	0
Elegible in process	7	5	2
Refusals	106	99	7
Out of target	85	60	25
Impossible to contact	473	399	74
Ineligible - coop.	0	0	0
Refusal to the Screener	17	10	7
Total	1078	823	255

	ELIGIBLES			
Eligible	1.Elegible establishment (Correct name and address)	503	354	149
	2. Elegible establishment (Different name but same address - the new firm/establishment bought the original firm/establishment)	0	0	0
	3. Eligible establishment (Different name but same address - the firm/establishment changed its name)	0	0	0
	4. Eligible establishment (Wrong address - the firm/establishmen has changed address and the address could be found)	0	0	0
	16. Panel firm - now less than five employees	0	0	0
Ineligible	5. The establishment has less than 5 permanent full time employees	3	3	0
	6. The firm discontinued businesses	58	35	23
	7. Not a business: private household	0	0	0
	8. Ineligible activity: education, agriculture, finances, governments…	24	22	2
Unobtainable	91. No reply *(after having called in different days of the week and in different business hours)*	122	110	12
	92. Line out of order	4	4	0
	93. No tone	0	0	0
	94. Phone number does not exist	5	2	3
	10. Answering machine	0	0	0
	11. Fax line - data line	0	0	0
	12. Wrong address/ moved away and could not get the new references	342	283	59
	13. Refuses to answer the screener	17	10	7
	14. In process *(the establishment is being called/ is being contacted - previous to ask the screener)*	91	77	14
	151. Out of target - outside the covered regions, firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	152. Out of target - firm moved abroad	0	0	0
	153. Impossible to find	0	0	0
	Total	1169	900	269

A.29.3. Survey and item non-response

The number of completed interviews per contacted establishment was 0.36. This number is the result of two factors: explicit refusals to participate in the survey, as reflected by the rate of rejection (which includes rejections of the screener and the main survey) and the quality of the sampling frame, as represented by the presence of ineligible units. The number of rejections per contact was 0.11.

A.29.4. Local agency team involved in the study and its comments on the implementation

Local agency team involved in the survey

Local agency	Name: SIAR Research and Consulting Group Country: Azerbaijan Membership of international organisation: N/A Active since: 1993
Name of Project Manager	Leyla Mehtiyeva/Gunay Jafarkuliyeva
Name and position of other key persons of the project	Ashraf Hajiyev, Project Director
Enumerators involved	Enumerators: 22
Other staff involved	Fieldwork Coordinators: 6 Data Editing: 2 Data Entry: 2 Data Processing: 2

Sampling frame

Characteristic of sample frame used	Database of State Statistics Committee of Uzbekistan, 2011
Source	Database of State Statistics Committee of Uzbekistan
Year of publication	2011
Comments on the quality of the sample frame	The database was found to be largely out of date: many phone numbers were incorrect; with all phone numbers belonging to one GSM operator being inactive because the operator had closed. Many addresses were missing, and much more time was spent finding the entities that it was expected in the set-up phase. Given these challenges, the time spent on field work increased as a result.
Year and organisation that conducted the last economic census	N/A

Sample

Comments/problems on sectors and regions selected in the sample	Namangan was excluded later on in fieldwork due to the heightened threat of terrorism and safety of interviewers. Remaining interviews were re-assigned to cells in other regions.
Comments on the response rate	The majority of respondents who were found and with whom it was possible to establish contact were eager to answer the questions
Comments on the sample design	The field team took a bit of time to adjust to the sample design but after additional explanations there were no problems with the design.

Fieldwork

Date of fieldwork	January 2013 – October 2013
Country	Uzbekistan
Number of completed interviews	22
Problems found during fieldwork	The biggest problem was with the sample quality and the out of date contact information. Local government entities also proved obstructive in efforts to obtain more up to date information; it took time to handle them. A great deal of time was therefore spent on searching for correct contact information
Other observations	Advance letters were sent to some contacts; telephone was the main means of first contact (where a telephone number was available); sometimes e-mail was used. This was followed by face to visits.

Questionnaires

Problems for the understanding of questions (write question number)	Questions were generally well understood. Sometimes the language was a little bit technical

Problems found in the navigability of questionnaires (for example, skip patterns)	During the first few days interviewers had trouble with the skip from D3 to D10, but then they got used to it Interviewers struggled to find q69
Comments on questionnaire length	The questionnaire was rather long and it took a lot of time to answer the questions. Before the interview respondents were informed about approximate duration of the interview, and that helped to limit any complaints about interview length during the interview itself. Only some respondents were busy and asked interviewers to wait, meaning that the interview lasted far longer than average.
Suggestions or other comments on the questionnaires	Shortening some questions and the use of less technical language might help with respondent comprehension

Quality control

Fieldwork monitoring	Six interviewers were retrained due to a failure to correctly follow the routing and a higher number of refusals to questions than the average. QC was mainly by phone, and visits were conducted in cases when it was not possible to dial the organisation. Respondents were asked about the length of the interview, usage of showcards as well as some of the questions in the questionnaire to check consistency of responses.
Data checking procedures	Data was frequently spot checked, and logic checks of all interviews took place in parallel to fieldwork procedures. In addition to logic checks, refusal rates per interview were also closely monitored.
Number of respondents selected for back-checking	140
Selection procedures	The interviews to be checked were randomly selected. Back-checks were also made for all interivews where there logic checks had revealed problems. The addititoinal logic checks meant that the total number of checked questionnaires appeared to be higher than it was planned initially.
Who carried out back-checks?	The back-check was conducted by a special quality control team in conjuction with fieldwork supervisors.
Mode of contact	Telephone
Number of completed interviews back-checked	125
Number of non-responses back-checked	12
Results of alternative method of contacting non-respondents	N/A
Description of what was covered inthe back-checks	The name of the establishment, screener sector, main product/service, length of interview, usage of show-cards, answers to some questions.
Number of completed interviews that were rejected and why	N/A
G1 Time to obtain a construction permit – checks on the data	**Time to obtain a construction permit** *Problem* The survey findings In Uzbekistan show that the average number of days to obtain a permit is 30, but the Doing Business report suggests that the average should be closer to 150. It was understood that this discrepancy might have been because the question does not reference all the procedures, but this needed to be double-checked. *Task* SIAR to check with the local team about definition and if data entry correct *SIAR findings and response* Officially firms are granted a permit 30 days after submission of the documents. However, what takes a lot of time is the following: receiving permits to access the territory for construction; receiving documents for different scales of construction (smaller changes through to larger ones);

	receiving documents for construction of different forms of building, such as residential versus non-residential building. The application process for these documents is separate and takes much time. Apparently the government is now working on how to ease these processes too, but this is a recent initiative and will not have fed through to the results for this survey.
M1a Biggest obstacle to business – checks on the data	*Problem* The World Bank queried the high proportion of not applicable (-7) responses at m1a for Uzbekistan. The figure of more than 40% is far higher than any other country for BEEPS, including the other two countries in which SIAR operates: Azerbaijan and Tajikistan. The findings also appear to be at odds with the experience of the local World Bank office in relation to business obstacles, where it is felt that there are many. *Task* SIAR to verify that the figures were correct; if they were found to be correct to provide a short written explanation of why these results might have come about. *SIAR findings and response* The figures were verified by the country manager and found to be correct. There appear to be several reasons behind the high proportion of non-responses, but the key factor is that whilst firms might have cited aspects of business relating to the government as a relative obstacle in individual questions, overall they didn't consider any of these to be major obstacles. It should be noted that on many of the individual questions the majority of respondents said that the aspects of the business environment that they were asked about either presented a minor obstacle – or more likely no obstacle at all – and that included infrastructure as well as regulations. 1) The government has recently "made life easy" for newly established entities. They do not send any tax officers until the beginning of the 4th year after the establishment was founded. All the reporting (monthly and quarterly) has been removed and only the annual reports are provided. Almost all tax audits are cancelled. If the company passes an audit by auditors (not tax committee) it is enough for the government, and they do not send the tax officers there. If the company helps orphanages, or employs graduates, then the taxes are considerably decreased or cancelled. They are also granted some privileges during tax audits and during submission of the tax reports. Reporting is done online, and people rarely visit the tax committee. The government has also introduced one-window-policy and now it takes very small amount of time to register the business. Before it used to require 10-20 organizations to be visited; and each required up to 10-20 days to "pass them". Now it is much easier to register and the new businesses are not paying taxes within first 2 years. 2) Corruption has become much less frequent. Before the tax officers were coming to the office and requesting a bribe in an open manner. Now it takes time even to find a person to whom one can offer a bribe: officials are afraid to take them. Only exchange is still a big problem and for some companies customs is a pain in this respect. 3) There has been a drive to reduce administrative burdens: the government has eased the process for obtaining licenses and certificates. 4) Other items listed at this question might be obstacles but were not perceived as big when considered in relation to the business as a whole.

Database

Data entry program chosen	SPSS, WebADC
Comments on the data entry program	None
Comments on the data cleaning	None

Country situation

General aspects of economic, political or social situation of the country that could affect the results of the survey	N/A
Relevant country events that occurred during fieldwork	Holidays had the biggest effect, leading to breaks in fieldwork. International Women Day (March,8), Novruz (March 21), Independence Day (September 1), Ramadan (August, 8-9)
Other aspects	N/A