MOST IMMEDIATE

Government of India
Ministry of Home Affairs
OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR GENERAL, INDIA
2A, Man Singh Road, New Delhi-110011

No. 9/ 50 /2012-CD(CEN) **Dated: October 29, 2012**

CENSUS CIRCULAR NO.37

Subject : Scrutiny and clearance of PCA 2011

As you are aware, the Primary Census Abstract (PCA) is to be released soon. I trust that you have completed the work of coverage check for all the districts of your State/UT by now. The next task is to check the data for completeness and quality. To achieve this in time bound manner close coordination is required between the Census and the Data Processing staff. This circular deals with scrutiny and clearance of data for the PCA.

2. The first step is the setting up of Task Force under the Chairmanship of DCO for clearance of the PCA. The following reports will be sent by the office of the Registrar General, India to you as and when they are ready.

(a) PCA at District, Sub-district, Town, Ward and Village level.
(b) Summary report of Administrative Units (Annexure-I)
(c) State/District level comparative statements showing data on all PCA items for 2011 Census, and 2001 Census (recast). (Annexure-II)
(d) Frequency distribution of villages on population, population (0-6), Sex Ratio and literacy and work participation by various ranges. (Annexure-III)
(e) Quality Check (QC) Reports, as an additional input for your assistance which gives error list based on village to village comparison on various PCA items for 2011 Census and 2001 Census. (Annexure-IV)
(f) Final Coverage Report (7 sheets) after incorporating For-Read and deletion cases.

3. All the above mentioned Statements/Tables will be sent to you by this office district by district for a more objective, systematic and quick scrutiny of PCA in your office. Based on their detailed scrutiny/quality check, **the scrutiny teams will be preparing district wise notes to serve as input to the Task Force highlighting the important observations and findings.** It should not take more than one/two days for scrutiny team to finalize its finding for a district. Therefore, a calendar should be drawn for the Task Force for clearance of PCA, district by district, by suitably prioritizing the districts.

4. A similar National Level Task Force is also being set up at the ORGI and will do Quality Checking and clearing of districts/state level PCAs. Once a state level

PCA is complete, Task force meeting will be called and the Directors/JDCOs/DDCOs along with their teams will be invited to make a presentation highlighting the main findings of the PCA in their respective states and also problems, which are required to be attended. After clearance by the National Task Force, the state PCA will be finalized.

5. The paragraphs given below describe the procedures to be adopted for content/quality checking of PCA data.

6. At the time of scrutiny and quality checking of PCA at the Directorate level, it is very important to have a proper perspective and not get unduly bothered with small variations. Any large scale data processing carries with it a component of error. The higher the levels of aggregation, the more likely these errors will cancelled out while at the lower levels, these may be more visible.

7. At the very beginning, a summary of Administrative Units (Annexure-I), containing the following district level information, will be given.

a. Total number of sub districts in the data (2011)
b. Total number of sub districts in the code directory (2011)
c. Total number of Statutory Towns in the data (2011)
d. Total number of Statutory Towns in the code directory (2011)
e. Total number of Census Towns in the data (2011)
f. Total number of Census Towns in the code directory (2011)
g. Total number of Out Growths in the data (2011)
h. Total number of Out Growths in the code directory (2011)
i. Total number of villages in the data (2011)
j. Total number of villages in the code directory (2011)
k. Total number of villages of 2011 with no data
l. Total number of villages of 2011 having data and matched with 2001
m. Total number of Inhabited village in 2001 which have matched with 2011

8. Although the numbers of various administrative units for 2011 Census as shown above have already been verified and concluded at the time of coverage checking of PE data for the district, yet these numbers are again to be confirmed at the time of finalization of PCA and ensured that there is no room for any omission or duplication. It would also be appropriate to reconcile the number of villages, uninhabited villages, towns, UAs and its constituents, wards, special charges and ensure their inclusion, completeness and correctness for each and every district.

9. Item (l) is the number of inhabited villages of 2011 which could be linked to the 2001 villages, irrespective of the fact that a few of these 2001 villages (linked) were uninhabited. It may also be noted that the 2001 villages that have been linked may not belong to the district for which QC report is being generated.

10. Item (m) gives the number of inhabited villages of 2001 which could be linked with inhabited or uninhabited villages of 2011. These villages have been

used to work out the summary tables in the QC Report for 2001, while for 2011, the villages at Item (i) have been used.

11. The State/District level Summary Report (Annexure-II) compares data for all items of PCA with the corresponding data of 2001 Census. The rates and ratios will also be provided to facilitate comparisons. State Task Force will have to examine the district level reports critically. Any serious discrepancy along with the proposed solution should immediately be brought to the notice of the Census Division.

12. The quality check (QC) Report will be prepared mainly to provide as an aid to the State Task force with a view to facilitate the scrutiny of PCA data at village level. It will have basically two parts; (a) Summary Report on Frequency Distribution (b) Error list.

13. The Summary Report on Frequency Distribution (Annexure-III) will be essentially a frequency distribution of villages by class intervals of various PCA data items for the Census 2011 and 2001.

14. It will provide frequency distributions of villages by different size-classes for a number of data items for the years 2001 and 2011. These comparative distributions of villages, will also include their percentage distributions, giving a broad picture of the changes that have occurred in the villages during the decade 2001-2011 and will reflect the overall magnitude and direction of change of the variable in the district. These summaries will help to have a feel of the PCA data at the village level. In some of the Summary tables the extreme values of the variables such as '0' or '100' have been intentionally included in the class interval. This is with the purpose of knowing if there are any villages with such extreme values and needs to investigate into its reason. In fact, it will be required to look at other values of the variables which are at both the extremes (not necessarily '0' or '100') by appropriately sorting and filtering of the PCA and investigate the reasons for abnormalities.

15. The series of Error List (Annexure-IV) isolates the villages which fail the test of scrutiny based on certain pre-decided standard values for the variables under scrutiny.

16. To facilitate the process of scrutiny a set of tolerance tests have been applied on the village PCA for 2011. The villages that fail the tolerance test listed in the set of Error lists will be included in the QC Report for each district of 2011 Census. As stated earlier, some of the tolerance test criteria will be based on comparison with the 2001 villages while the others only based on village PCA data for 2011 Census. A list of type of QC checks on the various PCA items included in the report is enclosed. You will notice in most of the cases the test criteria are applied only for the villages with population 200 + because it is felt that villages with below 200 population would be prone to high variation. In a few cases the cut-off values for errors have been made a function of the population again recognizing the fact that lower the population of a village more volatile it would be. It may be that in many States/UTs some of the suggested criterion may result in a lot of villages failing the test. In any case, if a proper and systematic procedure is followed, it should be

possible for the scrutiny teams to list out easily the errors even if the number of villages failing the test is large.

17. Since the determination of the Population (P) of a village which is very crucial, followed by Males (M) and Females (F) and the values of all the other characteristics revolve around the values of P, M and F ,it is extremely crucial to ensure that P, M and F values of a village are correct. The first few Error lists relate to the determination of the Population through the comparison of the absolute number and the decadal growth of population. There are a number of test criteria depending on the 2011 Census population of the villages. The first among the series of Error lists relate to the villages with population range 201-500. In this test, a cut-off value of district (rural) growth rate+25 percentage points has been taken. Thus the list of villages in the population range 201-500 with district (rural) growth rate + 25 percentage points would constitute the first error list. In the subsequent Error lists the population range cut-offs are gradually increased and tolerance levels are gradually reduced. This set of Error lists is followed by the listing of villages showing decline in population between 2001 and 2011. Here also, a graduated test criteria has been used.

18. It is equally important to identify reasons for these villages failing the test. It is recommended to look for the following:-

(a) Whether the 2011 Census village has been correctly linked with the 2001 Census village. If not, such cases need to be notified to the Census division at once.
(b) Whether the 2001 population and other characteristics are correct in case of doubt refer to the printed figures in the 2001 DCHB.
(c) Whether there is a shift in the EBs for PCA 2011 resulting in increase or decrease of population over 2001.
(d) Whether the village has a special charge in 2011 Census or had a special charge in 2001 which is no longer there.
(e) Whether part of the village in 2011 which was fully a village in 2001, has been merged in a town or treated as Out Growth in 2011 or vice versa.
(f) Whether the village has split during 2001-2011.
(g) Whether new projects/factories etc. have come up in 2011 or the projects/factories existing in 2001 had closed down.
(h) Whether the schedules of another EB has got mixed up. In this case please look for the comparison with the basic Census Records again.
(i) Whether the village is contiguous or in neighbourhood to an economically and commercially growing town.
(j) Any reason locally known to the Directorate.

19. It is expected that answers to the problem for each such village from among the probable reasons listed above would be found. Sometimes it would be required to look for supplementary clues elsewhere. For example, if the village includes a special military or para-military charge, the sex ratio is expected to be low and the percentage of male 0-6 population to total male population is also expected to be low. You should not be unduly worried about the villages which are beyond or closer to the tolerance limits in an Error list. For example, if the tolerance limit is

30%, you may prefer to scrutinize the villages showing growth rates of 50% or more again depending on the size of the village. This is because an extra allowance of 20 percentage points in case of a relatively big village may translate into a wrong placement of EB. In few situations you may also have to refer to the basic Census records to look for serious processing errors, if any. It should therefore be increasingly clear that a lot of systematic and logical judgment and some local knowledge has to be brought into play while resolving the errors. **Only refer the Charge /District/ Town level officers, if it is wanted, due to lack of information from the 2001 and 2011 records.**

20. The general consistency checks such as Total Population would be = Male Population + Female Population, Male Population would not be > Male (SC) + Male (ST), Female Population would not be > Female (SC) + Female (ST), Male population would be = Male Worker + Male Non- Worker, Female Population would be = Female worker + Non-Worker, Male population would be > Male(0-6) + Male (literates), Female Population would be > Female (0-6) + Female (Literates), Number of Female Workers (Main + marginal) would be generally < Male Workers (Main + Marginal), Number of Female Cultivators would be < Male cultivators, etc may be applied in the DCO and inconsistencies, if any, may be sorted out.

21. You are requested to keep in mind the time constraint so that PCA for a district should be cleared within seven days of its receipt in the Directorate. The State Task force should clearly document all the clarifications/answers that they have found for resolving the errors listed in the QC Report. You will have to bring this document in the meeting of the National Task Force which will also discuss the QC report for every district.

22. In so far as towns and their constituents are concerned they may be scrutinized at DCO level by studying the population growth, comparing sex ratios, work participation rate etc., across the towns in 2011 and also with the 2001 data. It would be necessary to compare the population at the ward levels in situations where ward jurisdictions have not changed during 2001-2011. It would be better to compare the final populations of these towns/ wards with the provisional populations. The PCA for the UAs and their constituents will be sent soon for your State for checking and ensuring the coverage of the UAs and their constituents.

23. As soon as the scrutiny of district is completed send a certificate indicating that the PCA data for the villages, wards, towns, CD Block, tahsil, UA and the district are found to be correct. In case there are problems in the data and it is unable to clear them please send a note clearly listing out the problem areas without any delay. The National Task Force on PCA set up at the ORGI will always be available to you for any assistance required in finalizing your state PCA.

Please acknowledge receipt of this circular.

(C. Chandramouli)
Registrar General and
Census Commissioner, India

To

All Directorates of Census Operations

End.No. 9/ 50 /2012-CD(CEN) **Dated: October 29, 2012**

Copy to:

1. Addl. Directors, DRG(C&T), DRG(PKB), DRG(Map), DRG(SRS), DRG(CRS), ARG(Demo), Addl.Dir.(EDP), JD(A.K.Srivastava), JD(Anil Kumar), JD(SS), ARG(SS), DS(A), SRO(Language Division)
2. JD(OL) for immediate Hindi translation
3. PPS to HS
4. PPS to RGI, PS to Consultant (Shri Sethi), PS to DDG(R), PPS to DDG(NPR), PPS to Director (Admn.)
5. Census Cell (15 copies)
6. Guard File