



**TOGETHER**  
*for a sustainable future*

## OCCASION

This publication has been made available to the public on the occasion of the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the United Nations Industrial Development Organisation.



**TOGETHER**  
*for a sustainable future*

## DISCLAIMER

This document has been produced without formal United Nations editing. The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this document do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries, or its economic system or degree of development. Designations such as “developed”, “industrialized” and “developing” are intended for statistical convenience and do not necessarily express a judgment about the stage reached by a particular country or area in the development process. Mention of firm names or commercial products does not constitute an endorsement by UNIDO.

## FAIR USE POLICY

Any part of this publication may be quoted and referenced for educational and research purposes without additional permission from UNIDO. However, those who make use of quoting and referencing this publication are requested to follow the Fair Use Policy of giving due credit to UNIDO.

## CONTACT

Please contact [publications@unido.org](mailto:publications@unido.org) for further information concerning UNIDO publications.

For more information about UNIDO, please visit us at [www.unido.org](http://www.unido.org)

23016

**UNIDO – SRI LANKA INTEGRATED PROGRAMME  
INDUSTRIAL STATISTICS COMPONENT**

**Project No.TF/SRL/99/002  
Contract No.2002/037**

**UPDATE THE INDUSTRIAL  
REGISTRY  
WESTERN PROVINCE**

**Final Report**

**By**

**Department of Census and Statistics**

**June 2004**

***Small & Medium Enterprise Developers***



A Project of Federation of Chambers of Commerce & Industry of Sri Lanka in collaboration with the Friedrich Naumann Foundation  
Level 4, No. 53, Vauxhall Lane, Colombo 02, Sri Lanka. Phone: 304287-9, Fax: 304291 E-mail: [projsmmed@slt.lk](mailto:projsmmed@slt.lk)

## Final DCS report for Phase 4 of Statistics Project

*by D.C.A. Gunawardena , June 2004*

The following material comprises a series of 4 reports that constitute the deliverables for Phase 4 as final report of Sri Lanka Statistics Project, as modified by Alex Korns, the International Consultant, UNIDO industrial updating Project.

More specifically, the deliverables identified are :

1.	Analyse results of DI-2 (IIB), prepare paper on results	E71
2.	Analyse results of ASI-2(I-B) prepare paper on results	F85
3.	Report for MOID	H93
4.	Report for BOI	G87

## Analyse results of DI-2 (II-B), Prepare paper on results

A Survey of candidates (DI-2) for addition to the Directory to be conducted each year, to assure that directory discovers most new large/medium Industry.

The DI-2 Questionnaire, as developed with the assistance of International consultant, is shown in Annex i. The Questionnaire includes most of the data items needed in the new registry data base.

This Survey was carried out for the first time in the field in Western Province using Questionnaire with 2012 candidates. DI-2 data was entered, prepared the error free data file and obtained the necessary tabulation for analyse results.

*DI-2 results.* Some overall findings are summarized in Table I below which shows the number of candidates, by source, divided into two main groups : Successful and Unsuccessful.

Table I - DI-2 Summary Results, by Source Group

Source	All Checked		Successful Candidates by employment					Un successful candidates, by reason							
	Total	Percent Success	All	100+	50- 99	30- 49	20- 29	All	Commercial Production		Re check next year	Closed	Moved etc.	Non - Industry	Not found
									(>19)	(<20)					
MOID	451	41.5%	204	86	17	40	23	287	41	46	7	64	35	53	37
BOI	456	62.1%	283	155	56	41	31	173	35	38	5	40	14	22	19
EPF	904	15.6%	141	46	35	25	35	763	17	77	3	205	127	268	66
CEB	140	35.7%	50	22	14	7	7	90	17	8	4	25	4	22	10
Old DCS	21	14.3%	3	2	0	0	1	18	2	4	0	5	2	3	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>33.8%</b>	<b>681</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>1331</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>134</b>

Note-- Unsuccessful candidates in commercial production with 20 or more workers were duplicates with the core registry.

Of the 2012 candidates checked in the field, 681(33.8 percent), qualified for addition to the New DCS registry. Among the 1331 that did not qualify, 339 were closed, 368 had shifted into non-industry, 173 were small (fewer than 20 workers), 186 were located in a district other than the Western Province, 134 could not found, 112 in commercial production with 20 or more workers were duplicates with the Core registry.

Of the 2012 candidates checked in the field, 491 were from the Ministry of Enterprise Development, Industrial Policy and Investment Production (MOID), 906 from the Employees' Provident Fund (EPF), 140 from the Ceylon Electricity Board and 21 from the old DCS registry (non response for several earlier years).

In terms of success rates (percent qualifying for additions to the registry), BOI was the most productive source, 62 percent, followed by MOID and CEB, with success rates of 42 and 34 percent respectively. EPF and Old DCS (last responded sometime before 1998) had the lowest success rates. The biggest surprise in all this was the low score for EPF, only 16 percent. For EPF, among 763 that did not qualify for the registry, 268 (35 percent) had shifted to non industry or out of scope, 205 (27 percent) were closed, 77 (10 percent) were small (fewer than 20 workers), 66 (7 percent) could not be found. For the DCS non response group (Old DCS), among the 18 that did not qualify, 5 were closed, 4 were small, and 3 had shifted to non-industry.

Among the 681 Successful Candidates, that Qualify for the new registry, nearly half had 100 or more workers as shown in the table 2 (see Annex 2). Other tabulation showed that the 681 together had about approximately 163,000 employees, most of whom worked for the 311 establishments with 100 or more workers. When the discoveries are sorted by year of commercial production, it appears that an average of 50 establishments (20 and more workers) started production in each of the year 1997-2001. This finding indicates that annual updating capture 50 or more new establishments per year for the Western Province.

Table II presents the same results broken down by the 16 groups as high, Medium and low priority categories from which 2012 RMES (results of matching with external sources) establishments were selected for the field check of DI-2 sample. As can be seen from the table II, the results did not confirm the priorities used for the selecting candidates. The most significant failures involved EPF. Although the high and medium priorities were given to EPF data, the success rate records around 17 percent.

REPORT E71

Table II. - Results for the DI-2 Survey of Candidates, by detailed source groups, December 2002

Source Group	All Checked			Successful Candidates by employment				Un successful candidates, by reason							
	RMES total*	DI-2 total	Percent Success	Total	100+	50- 99	20- 49	All	Commercial Production		Re check next year	Closed	Moved etc.	Non Industry	Not found
									(Emp 20+)	(Emp<20)					
<b>High Priority</b>															
1 Bol Section 17	362	360	69.4%	250	143	43	64	110	29	23	2	27	10	8	11
2 MoID 98-00, 25+	454	446	43.3%	193	81	47	65	253	38	32	6	54	37	51	35
3 EPF 50+	513	506	15.6%	79	39	25	15	427	13	31	0	132	79	138	34
<b>Total</b>	<b>1329</b>	<b>1312</b>	<b>39.8%</b>	<b>522</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>790</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>Medium Priority</b>															
4 Bol Section 16	90	87	28.7%	25	8	10	7	62	6	15	3	13	4	13	8
5 EPF 20-49	348	344	18.0%	62	8	12	42	282	5	35	2	60	48	104	28
6 DCS 95-97, matched	4	4	25.0%	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	2	0	1	0
7 DCS pre-95, matched	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8 MoID 95-97, 25+, matched	6	6	66.7%	4	3	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
9 MoID pre-95, 25+, matched	5	5	40.0%	2	1	1	0	3	0	1	0	2	0	0	0
10 MoID, 15-24, matched	27	26	19.2%	5	1	0	4	21	1	13	0	2	0	3	2
11 EPF 15-19, matched CEB	1	1	0.0%	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>481</b>	<b>473</b>	<b>20.9%</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>374</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Low Priority</b>															
12 DCS pre-95	14	13	7.7%	1	1	0	0	12	2	4	0	3	1	1	1
13 MoID, 95-97, unmatched	58	9	44.4%	4	3	0	1	5	0	0	1	4	0	0	0
14 EPF 15-19, unmatched CEB	135	22	4.5%	1	0	0	1	21	0	6	0	7	2	4	2
15 EPF 10-14	233	42	7.1%	3	0	0	3	39	0	5	1	6	1	23	3
16 CEB	829	141	36.2%	51	23	14	14	90	17	8	1	25	4	22	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>1269</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>26.4%</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>3079</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>33.8%</b>	<b>681</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>1331</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>134</b>

- Except for the total in the RMES column, all figures in the table refer to results for the DI-2 sample of 2012 candidates

While it had been expected that many EPF establishment would turn out to be small due to report less figure for employment, this reason accounted for only a small share of unsuccessful candidates. Nevertheless, as can be seen in the table2 (Annex 2), success rates were indeed much lower for EPF establishments with less than 20 workers than for those with 20 or more.

Most of the 763 unsuccessful EPF candidates were either non-industry (35 percent), or closed (27 percent) or could not be found (9 percent) for various reason. The fact that so many non-industry cases were found in the EPF data was particular surprising. These results indicate severe weakness in the EPF data with regard to industrial activity code were recoded as mfg. industry. The number of non-

industry cases, 268 exceeded the number of industrial establishments found to be commercial production, whether large or small (218). This finding further implies that the EPF coding of establishment by ISIC is unreliable.

Coding was undertaken by a private software company who were not familiar the ISIC coding system, on the basis of very brief description of activity from the declaration form.

Special interest attaches to the group of establishments that are registered neither with MOID nor with BOI, in as much as DCS has always relied only on MOID and BOI for annual updating its registry for large establishments.

In the DI-2 survey, it was reveal that 85 establishments were said to be registered neither at MOID nor BOI, of these, 85 establishments, 82 were registered with EPF and also 77 were registered with CEB. Much interest therefore attaches to using CEB data for filling gaps left by MOID and BOI.

*Results by district.* Of the total discoveries, four establishments were located outside the Western Province : these occurred when enumerators followed lead on establishment that had head office in the Western Province or that had out of Western Province Districts. When the discoveries are broken down by the three districts in the Western Province, Gampaha had the largest number, 330, While Colombo had the second largest number, 282. The success rate was much larger in Gampaha (40 percent) than in Colombo (only 27 percent).

The higher success rate in Gampaha is surely related in part to the fact that Gampaha discoveries were newer than those in Colombo. Fully 50 percent of Gampaha Discoveries (equal to 164) begin production after 1995 while only 27 percent of those in Colombo (equal to 75) began after 1995. Overall only 273 of the 681 discoveries (40 percent) began production after 1995, which indicates that the Pilot many succeeded in discovering older establishments that had long been missed by the DCS registry.

The Survey also asked establishment whether they had registered with DCS, MOID, BOI, EPF, CEB etc; Such data may be useful in guiding DCS in the choice of data sources for future updating process. The results reveal that 97 percent of establishment said they were registered with EPF, while 88 percent said they were registered with CEB. Furthermore 54 percent were registered with BOI and another 53 percent (some obviously, the same establishment) with MOID.

DEPARTMENT OF CENSUS AND STATISTICS  
SRI LANKA

**Updating  
Directory of Large/Medium Industry**

Survey of Candidates  
Survey Year 2002

This form is used when updating the DCS directory, for field checks of each candidate listed in RMES. It is filled by the enumerator with supervision by the District Statistical Office/Head office and checked by the Head Office. Data is entered and saved by the Head office.



Form DI - 2 : Updating of Directory of Large/Medium Industry  
For Survey Year 2002 : Candidate Establishment

BLOCK I - Filled by the Enumerator												
RMES seq No.										Source code		
1. Province					2. District							
3. D.S. Division					4. MC/UC/PS*							
5. Ward/Village/Estate*					6. G.N. Division							
7. Establishment situation/status 2002												
- in commercial production, employing 20 or more workers										1		
- in commercial production, employing <20 workers (record in block IV)										2		
- To be rechecked next year										3		
- Existed before but now closed										4		(if code 2 or 9, go to item 15)
- Located in another district, because moved, incorrect address or address noted in RMES(C) is the head office's but not the factory's (write down correct address in block IV)										5		<input type="checkbox"/>
- Non-Industry(specify) .....										6		
- Not found										9		
8. Establishment Particulars				Field check for location				Field check for Head office				
(a) Establishment Name												
suffix												
(b) Industrial Estate												
(c) Address												
Assessment No.												
Floor No.												
Building Name or complex												
Street Name												
Village/ward name												
City/ town name												
Postal code												
Other(P.O.Box, Mile post,etc.)												
(d) Telephone No.(prefix/number)												
Telephone No.(prefix/number)												
(e) Fax No.(prefix/number)												
(f) E-mail address												
9. Average No. of workers during 2001								No. of workers				
10. Discription of Industry								ISIC				
11. Year started commercial production				month ..... year .....				mth.		yr.		
12. Contact person												
Name												
Position												
Telephone No.(prefix/number)												
Fax No.(prefix/number)												
E-mail address												
13. Is this establishment registered with following agencies(multiple answers accepted)				1. DCS 2. MOID 3. BOI 4. EPF 5. CEB 6. IDB				7. EDB 8. TQB 9. Other(specify).....				
14. Were you able to enter the establishment while filling out this questionnaire? if "No" explain from whom you got this information Block IV								Yes - 1		No - 2		
15. Enumerator Name & ID.				Name:				ID.:				
16. Signature and Enumeration Date				Signature:				Date:				



Table 1 : Establishment in 2002 by year of commercial production (Successful Candidates)

District	Source	No. of Establishments that began commercial production								Total
		pre-91	1991-95	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	
<b>WESTERN PROVINCE</b>										
	OldDCS	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	3
	MOID	50	128	6	2	2	7	4	5	204
	BOI	80	39	15	30	45	24	25	25	283
	EPF	37	48	2	6	17	12	13	6	141
	CEB	8	16	3	4	2	4	5	8	50
	<b>TOTAL :</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>681</b>
<b>COLOMBO</b>										
	OldDCS	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	3
	MOID	37	77	3	0	1	5	0	1	124
	BOI	30	12	3	10	7	6	3	13	84
	EPF	14	26	0	1	2	3	1	2	49
	CEB	2	7	3	2	2	3	2	1	22
	<b>TOTAL :</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>282</b>
<b>GAMPAHA</b>										
	MOID	8	41	1	2	0	2	3	2	59
	BOI	39	25	10	17	31	15	18	6	161
	EPF	22	22	2	5	15	9	12	4	91
	CEB	3	6	0	2	0	0	2	6	19
	<b>TOTAL :</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>330</b>
<b>KALUTARA</b>										
	MOID	5	10	2	0	1	0	1	2	21
	BOI	11	2	2	3	7	3	4	6	38
	EPF	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	CEB	3	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	9
	<b>TOTAL :</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>69</b>

Source: Dept. of Census & Statistics

Table 2 : Results of 2002 survey

District	Source	Successful Candidates						In Successful Candidates					Total Checked	Percent success			
		All	100+	50-99	30-49	20-29	All (Emp 20+)	Commer. Produ. (Emp < 20)	To be rechecked next year	Closed	Located in another district	Non Industry			Not found		
<b>WESTERN PROVINCE</b>																	
	OldDCS	3	2	0	0	1	0	18	2	4	0	5	2	3	2	21	14.3%
	MOID	204	86	47	40	31	0	287	41	46	7	64	39	53	37	491	41.5%
	BOI	283	155	56	41	31	0	173	35	38	5	40	14	22	19	456	62.1%
	EPF	141	46	35	25	35	0	763	17	77	3	205	127	268	66	904	15.6%
	CEB	50	22	14	7	7	0	90	17	8	4	25	4	22	10	140	35.7%
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>681</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,331</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>2,012</b>	<b>33.8%</b>
<b>COLOMBO</b>																	
	OldDCS	3	2	0	0	1	1	14	2	4	0	2	2	3	1	17	17.6%
	MOID	124	53	31	22	18	18	176	25	29	2	35	30	33	22	300	41.3%
	BOI	84	37	17	14	16	16	65	9	17	3	6	9	13	8	149	56.4%
	EPF	49	11	16	8	14	14	470	9	15	2	105	121	183	35	519	9.4%
	CEB	22	11	5	2	4	4	47	7	1	0	9	4	18	8	69	31.9%
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>772</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>1,054</b>	<b>26.8%</b>
<b>GAMPAHA</b>																	
	OldDCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	0.0%
	MOID	59	23	14	12	10	10	89	12	12	4	22	7	19	13	143	39.9%
	BOI	161	95	33	22	11	11	97	22	20	2	31	4	8	10	258	62.4%
	EPF	91	34	19	17	21	21	272	8	54	1	98	6	75	30	363	25.1%
	CEB	19	7	5	5	2	2	37	8	6	4	14	0	3	2	56	33.9%
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>498</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>828</b>	<b>39.9%</b>
<b>KALUTARA</b>																	
	OldDCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0.0%
	MOID	21	10	2	6	3	3	22	4	5	1	7	2	1	2	43	48.8%
	BOI	38	23	6	5	4	4	11	4	1	0	3	1	1	1	49	77.6%
	EPF	1	1	0	0	0	0	21	0	8	0	2	0	10	1	22	4.5%
	CEB	9	4	4	4	0	1	6	2	1	0	2	0	1	0	15	60.0%
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>53.1%</b>

Source: Dept. of Census & Statistics

Table 3: Establishment in 2002 by Employment Size (Successful Candidates)

District	Source	Employment Size Class						Total
		20-24	25-29	30-34	35-49	50-99	100+	
<b>WESTERN PROVINCE</b>								
	OldDCS	1	0	0	0	0	2	3
	MOID	21	10	15	25	47	86	204
	BOI	13	18	17	24	56	155	283
	EPF	17	18	7	18	35	46	141
	CEB	4	3	2	5	14	22	50
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>681</b>
<b>COLOMBO</b>								
	OldDCS	1	0	0	0	0	2	3
	MOID	14	4	9	13	31	53	124
	BOI	6	10	8	6	17	37	84
	EPF	7	7	2	6	16	11	49
	CEB	2	2	0	2	5	11	22
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>282</b>
<b>GAMPAHA</b>								
	OldDCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	MOID	6	4	3	9	14	23	59
	BOI	5	6	8	14	52	95	151
	EPF	10	11	5	12	19	34	91
	CEB	1	1	2	3	5	7	19
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>330</b>
<b>KALUTARA</b>								
	OldDCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	MOID	1	2	3	3	2	10	21
	BOI	2	2	1	4	6	23	38
	EPF	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
	CEB	1	0	0	0	4	4	9
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>69</b>

Source: Dept. of Census & Statistics

Table 4 :Success rate by Source, 2002 survey

Source	Colombo			Gampaha			Kalutara			Western Province				
	Successful	Un Successful	Total	Success Rate	Un Successful	Total	Success Rate	Un Successful	Total	Success Rate	Un Successful	Total	Success Rate	
OIDDCS	3	14	17	17.6%	0	3	0.0%	0	1	0.0%	3	18	21	14.3%
MOID	124	176	300	41.3%	59	148	39.9%	21	22	48.8%	204	287	491	41.5%
BOI	84	65	149	56.4%	161	258	62.4%	38	11	77.6%	283	173	456	62.1%
EPF	49	470	519	9.4%	91	363	25.1%	1	21	4.5%	141	763	904	15.6%
CEB	22	47	69	31.9%	19	56	33.9%	9	6	60.0%	50	90	140	35.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>772</b>	<b>1,054</b>	<b>26.8%</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>828</b>	<b>39.9%</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>53.1%</b>	<b>681</b>	<b>1,331</b>	<b>2,012</b>	<b>33.8%</b>

Source: Dept of Census & Statistics

Table 5: No. of Establishments by Registered agencies (Successful)

District	Source	Registered agencies									
		Total	DCS	MOID	ROI	EPF	CEB	BBB	EDB	TQB	Other
<b>COLOMBO</b>											
	OldDCS	3	3	3	1	3	3	1	2	1	0
	MOID	123	51	123	20	116	96	24	43	11	0
	BOI	83	12	34	83	80	65	12	33	12	0
	EPF	49	4	16	9	49	40	3	13	5	0
	CEB	22	6	6	10	21	22	0	6	6	0
	<b>COLOMBO Total</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>269</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>GAMPAHA</b>											
	OldDCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	MOID	55	3	55	8	53	51	12	17	6	2
	BCI	153	19	27	153	149	146	9	74	14	0
	EPF	86	4	34	18	86	76	9	16	15	2
	CEB	19	0	5	6	18	19	5	2	0	1
	<b>GAMPAHA Total</b>	<b>313</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>KALUTARA</b>											
	OldDCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	MOID	21	6	21	7	20	19	8	11	5	0
	BOI	38	3	22	38	36	36	13	29	13	0
	EPF	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
	CEB	9	3	5	2	8	9	3	2	1	0
	<b>KALUTARA Total</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Western Province</b>											
	OldDCS	3	3	3	1	3	3	1	2	1	0
	MOID	199	35	199	35	189	166	44	71	22	2
	BOI	274	11	83	274	265	247	34	136	39	0
	EPF	136	8	51	27	136	117	12	30	20	2
	CEB	50	9	16	18	47	50	8	10	7	1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>662</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>640</b>	<b>583</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>5</b>

Table 6 : No. of Establishments neither Registered in MOID nor BOI by Registered agencies

District	Source	Registered agencies									
		Total	DCS	MOID	BOI	EPF	CEB	IDB	EDB	TQB	Other
COLOMBO											
	OldDCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	MOID	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	BOI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EPF	27	1	0	0	27	22	1	4	0	0
	CEB	9	3	0	0	8	9	0	1	0	0
	TOTAL	36	4	0	0	35	31	1	5	0	0
GAMPAHA											
	OldDCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	MOID	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	BOI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EPF	38	0	0	0	38	35	3	2	0	1
	CEB	8	0	0	0	7	8	1	0	0	1
	TOTAL	46	0	0	0	45	43	4	2	0	2
KALUTARA											
	OldDCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	MOID	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	BOI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EPF	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	CEB	3	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	0	0
	TOTAL	3	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	0	0
WESTERN PROVINCE											
	Old DCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	MOID	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	BOI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EPF	65	1	0	0	65	57	4	6	0	1
	CEB	20	3	0	0	17	20	2	1	0	1
	TOTAL	85	4	0	0	82	77	6	7	0	2

Source: Dept. of Census &amp; Statistics



Table 7: No. of Establishments by Source Group

WESTERN Province Source Group	Qualify by employment				Do not Qualify by reason						
	Total	100+	50-99	20-49	Total	Commer. Produ. (Emp 20+)	Commer. Produ. (Emp < 20)	To be rechecked next year	Located in another district	Non Industry	Not found
<b>High Priority</b>											
1 BOI Section 17	250	143	43	64	110	29	23	2	27	10	8
2 MOID 98-00, 25+	193	81	47	65	253	38	32	6	54	37	51
3 EPF 50+	79	39	25	15	427	13	31	0	132	79	138
<b>Total</b>	<b>522</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>790</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>197</b>
<b>Medium Priority</b>											
4 BOI Section 16	25	8	10	7	62	6	15	3	13	4	13
5 EPF 20-49	62	8	12	42	282	5	35	2	60	48	104
6 DCS 95-97, matched	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	2	0	1
7 DCS pre-95, matched	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8 MOID 96-97, 25+, matched	4	3	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	0
9 MOID pre-96, 25+, matched	2	1	1	0	3	0	1	0	2	0	0
10 MOID 15-24, matched	5	1	0	4	21	1	13	0	2	0	3
11 EPF 15-19, matched CEB	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>374</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>121</b>
<b>Low Priority</b>											
12 DCS, pre-95	1	1	0	0	12	2	4	0	3	1	1
13 MOID 96-97, unmatched	4	3	0	1	5	0	0	1	4	0	0
14 EPF 15-19, unmatched CEB	1	0	0	1	21	0	6	0	7	2	4
15 EPF 10-14	3	0	0	3	39	0	5	1	6	1	23
16 CEB	51	23	14	14	90	17	8	4	25	4	22
<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>681</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>1,331</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>368</b>

Source: Dept. of Census & Statistics.

Table 7 : No. of Establishments by Source Group (Ctd.)

COLOMBO District Source Group		Qualify by employment						Do not Qualify by reason				Non Industry	Not found	
		Total	100+	50-9	20-49	Total	Commer. Produ. (Emp 20+)	Commer. Produ. (Emp<20)	To be rechecked next year	Closed	Located in another district			
<b>High Priority</b>														
1	BOI Section 17	72	32	12	28	33	7	10	1	4	6	3		
2	MOID 98-00, 25+	116	49	30	37	155	23	19	2	31	28	32		
3	EPF 50+	27	9	10	8	264	8	7	0	60	76	97		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>452</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>132</b>		
<b>Medium Priority</b>														
4	BOI Section 16	11	4	5	2	32	2	7	2	2	3	10		
5	EPF 20-49	22	3	6	13	180	2	6	2	36	45	71		
6	LCS 95-97, matched	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		
7	DCS pre-95, matched	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
8	MOID 96-97, 25+, matched	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0		
9	MOID pre-96, 25+, matched	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
10	MOID 15-24, matched	3	1	0	2	15	1	10	0	1	0	1		
11	EPF 15-19, matched CEB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>83</b>		
<b>Low Priority</b>														
12	DCS, pre-95	1	1	0	0	10	2	4	0	2	1	1		
13	MOID 96-97, unmatched	2	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	0		
14	EPF 15-19, unmatched CEB	1	0	0	1	10	0	1	0	4	2	1		
15	EPF 10-14	0	0	0	0	22	0	1	0	5	1	15		
16	CEB	23	12	5	6	47	7	1	0	9	4	18		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>35</b>		
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>282</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>772</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>250</b>		

Table 7 : No. of Establishments by Source Group (Ctd.)

GAMPALA Districts Source Group	Qualify by employment					Do not Qualify by reason					Non Industry	Not found	
	Total	100+	50-99	20-49	Total	Commer. Prodn. (Emp 20+)	Commer. Prodn. (Emp<20)	To be rechecked next year	Closed	Located in another district			
<b>High Priority</b>													
1 BOI Section 17	144	90	26	28	69	19	13	1	21	3	4	8	
2 MOID 98-00, 25+	59	23	16	20	77	11	9	3	16	7	18	13	
3 EPF 50+	51	29	15	7	149	5	20	0	70	3	34	17	
<b>Total</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>295</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>38</b>	
<b>Medium Priority</b>													
4 BOI Section 16	10	2	4	4	27	3	7	1	10	1	3	2	
5 EPF 20-49	39	5	5	29	97	3	26	0	24	3	31	10	
6 DCS 95-97, matched	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	
7 DCS pre-95, matched	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
8 MOID 96-97, 25+, matched	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
9 MOID pre-96, 25+, matched	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	
10 MOID 15-24, matched	1	0	0	1	6	0	3	0	1	0	2	0	
11 EPF 15-19, matched CEB	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>12</b>	
<b>Low Priority</b>													
12 DCS, pre-95	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
13 MOID 96-97, unmatched	1	1	0	0	3	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	
14 EPF 15-19, unmatched CEB	0	0	0	0	11	0	5	0	3	0	3	0	
15 EPF 10-14	3	0	0	3	15	0	3	1	1	0	7	3	
16 CEB	19	7	5	7	37	8	6	4	14	0	3	2	
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>5</b>	
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>498</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>55</b>	

Table 7 : No. of Establishments by Source Group (Ctd.)

KALUTARA Districts Source Group	Qualify by employment				Do not Qualify by reason							
	Total	100+	50-99	20-49	Total (Emp 20+)	Commer. Produ. (Emp < 20)	Commer. Produ. (Emp < 20)	To be rechecked next year	Closed	Located in another district	Non Industry	Not found
<b>High Priority</b>												
1 BOI Section 17	34	21	5	8	8	3	0	0	2	1	1	1
2 MOID 98-00, 25+	18	9	1	8	21	4	4	1	7	2	1	2
3 EPF 50+	1	1	0	0	14	0	4	0	2	0	7	1
<b>Medium Priority</b>												
4 BOI Section 16	53	31	6	16	43	7	8	1	11	3	9	4
5 EPF 20-49	1	0	1	0	5	0	3	0	0	0	2	0
6 DCS 95-97, matched	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7 DCS pre-95, matched	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8 MOID 96-97, 25+, matched	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9 MOID pre-96, 25+, matched	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
10 MOID 15-24, matched	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11 EPF 15-19, matched CEB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Low Priority</b>												
12 DCS, pre-95	6	2	2	2	9	1	5	0	1	0	2	0
13 MOID 96-97, unmatched	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
14 EPF 15-19, unmatched CEB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15 EPF 10-14	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
16 CEB	9	4	4	1	6	2	1	0	2	0	1	0
<b>Grand Total</b>	10	5	4	1	9	2	2	0	2	0	2	1
	69	38	12	19	61	10	15	1	14	3	13	5

Source: Dept. of Census & Statistics

**Analyse results of ASI-2, prepare paper on results with tables  
and the size of the new registry**

Form ASI-2 : Establishment that are inactive,  
have moved or do not respond (Annex i)

When enumerator find a directory establishment that fails to the Annual Survey Questionnaire by the deadline for return of Questionnaire, Enumerator can fill out form ASI-2 (short form) to report the status of the establishment.

This Survey was also administered along with DI-2 at the same time. ASI stands for to the Annual Survey of Industry the two ASI Questionnaires (ASI-1, ASI-2) related to each other as follows:

- The ASI-1 is the standard Annual Survey of Industries Questionnaire, which DCS had mailed out in September to all establishments in the CORE registry only 336 of the 983 establishments in the CORE registry had responded.
- The ASI-2 Questionnaire is a kind of nil return : the first of its kind at DCS, designed to update the activity status and number of workers for ASI-1 non-respondents, as well as to compile data on phone number and contact persons. In December, the enumerators canvassed the 657 establishments that had not yet responded with the ASI-2.

Among the 647, 477 were confirmed as non respondents, while 170 had closed, moved away or fallen out of scope. This survey results revealed that there were 477 still active, but not respondent to the ASI-1. This occurred after visit the non-responding establishments at least one or in many cases more than once to get the questionnaire completed.

The closures were documented as follows 98 observed as closed, 21 moved to an unknown location, 37 could not be found. Another 9 moved with a clear address, while 3 were newly small and two were newly duplicates. The 9 that moved with a clear address can perhaps still be traced and it found can be restored to the new registry.

Among the 98 observed closures, the year of closures were obtained for 69 cases (rest were unknown) among which 60 had closed in the past 5 years that was since 1998, for an average

of 12 per year that were documented. Most closures were permanent only 12 (12 percent) of the cases document by ASI-2 were reported to be temporary.

During and after the ASI-2 visits, 42 establishments handed in ASI-1 Questionnaires, bringing total response to 386. When this is compared with the 813 CORE establishments still active and within scope the response rate is seen to be just 41 percent, a very small figure and to low to yield useful data.

Furthermore, it appears this has been a chronic problem for DCS, one that has been somewhat disguised by higher response rates among smaller establishments (ones with less than 20 workers) in the ASI sample.

*Size of the new registry for Western Province.* The ASI-2 found that 813 of the 983 CORE establishments were still active and within scope.

At the same time, the DI-2 discovered 681 establishments new to the directory, bringing total active establishments with 20 or more workers to 1461.

➤ Data structure for New Registry

Name of the Establishment

Name of the owner

Name of the contact person

Position of the contact person

Telephone No. (for the Est. contact person and Head Office)

Location address

Districts, DSD, MC/UC/GND

Industrial<sup>E</sup> state

Date of Discovery<sup>A</sup>

Year of Started commercial production

Description of Activity (ISIC) and etc.

**Results : New registry for Western Province (WP)**

A.	Core registry for WP :		<b>983</b>
A.1	Still active in CORE Registry		<b>813</b>
	ASI-1 Have Responded to ASI Questionnaire for 2002	336	
	ASI-2 Est. still active but not respondent to ASI-1	477	
A.2	Closed, duplicate		170
B.	New Discoveries (DI-2)		<b>681</b>
<b>Total active in New Registry (A.1+B, 813+681)</b>			<b>1494</b>

Size of the New registry : The total number of establishments with 20 or more workers in the Western Province based on the UNIDO standard Updating procedure were estimated to be number 1494.

The seminar was held to present the results of industrial updating in Western province with Dr. Alex Korns, International Consultant at the Ministry of Enterprise Development, Industrial Policy and Investment Promotion. Please find the Presentation below by D. C. A. Gunawardena, National Consultant of Pilot Study of Updating Industrial Registry in Western Province.

# **Pilot Study of Updating Industrial registry in Western Province**

Presentation by D.C.A. Gunawardena, Director of DCS

DCS has conducted an Annual Survey of Industries (ASI) for last 20 years. The frame is a by-product of last Industries Census in 1983.

This frame has not been comprehensively updated. Some limited updating was done from time to time for the larger establishments, using information from MED and BOI. Some closures were documented, while others were left in the registry as active.

As such the usefulness of ASI data has been greatly limited by DCS failure systematically to update its directory of Industry (DI).

UNIDO has worked with DCS to apply the standard UNIDO directory updating procedure to Sri Lanka. In order to test out the new procedure, a pilot study was designed to update the registry for the Western Province.



## **1. Data Sources**

**Initial data for the new system was obtained from five sources.**

- **The old DCS registry -- 1451**
- **Board of Investment (BOI) -- 664**
- **MOID -- 1184**
- **EPF -- 1475**
- **CEB -- 1285**

**All sources together -- 6059**

**EPF and CEB data was subject to the following limitations:**

- **Address problems and difficulty in distinguishing industry from non-industry.**
- **Name/address problems, lack of a good size indicator for CEB, lack of product codes for CEB.**

## **2. Data Parsing/Editing**

Data parsing and recoding are necessary so that the data from the sources and data in the registry can be matched easily. The following variables of the establishments are standardized:

### **1. A standard format for Establishment Names**

Terms referring to the establishments incorporation such as “Ltd”, “Pvt”, “Co” etc. are separated from the establishments name.

**E.g.: Kanada Lanka Apparels (pvt) Ltd  
Kanada Lanka Apparels (private) Limited**

**Company name without suffix: Kanada Lanka Apparels  
Company suffix: (Pvt) Ltd**

## 2. Standardizing Address Formats

The establishments location address is broken down to 8 fields as follows:

1. Floor No.
2. Building Name or Complex
3. Assessment No.
4. Other
5. Name of Street
6. Village ward Name
7. City/Town Name
8. Postal code

E.g.: 1. Location Address :

16<sup>th</sup> mile post,  
62, Galle Road,  
Henamulla, Panadura.

Floor No.	:	-
Assessment No.	:	62
Other	:	16 <sup>th</sup> mile post

**Street Name** : Galle Rd  
**Building / Complex Name** : -  
**Village / Ward** : Henamulla  
**City/Town Name** : Panadura  
**Postal Code** : 12500

### 3. Standardizing Telephone/Fax Number

E.g.: 916821

0	0	1	9	1	6	8	2	1
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

➤ 074 321641

0	7	4	3	2	1	6	4	1
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

### 4. Editing module

A separate editing module was needed to clean up various problems discovered during data parsing, including incorrect addresses, ISIC and district secretariat codes (DS code) etc.

### 3. Matching

The purpose of matching is to minimize duplication in field checking of registry candidates, by identifying candidates that match with candidates from other sources.

Matching was carried out in the following sequence. This ensured that each source-target pair reviewed only once.

First, the DCS registry was matched against MOID, BOI, EPF, and CEB.

Next, MOID was matched against BOI, EPF and CEB.

and so forth.

Nearly all matches were discovered by way of name matching.

500 Doubtful cases & telephone checks	
No. of Doubtful cases	500
No. of cases successful through telephone calls	208
No. of cases successful thru Tele Directory and placing calls	133
Unable to contact	159

**Table - Matching: source data and results**

	Old DCS	MOID	BOI	EPF	CEB
1. Employment cutoff	20	15	15	10	none
2. Records after parsing and editing	1451	1184	664	1475	1285
<b>Results of matching</b>					
3. Match w. old DCS		339	259	181	259
4. Match w. external source	694	158	153	123	209
5. Unmatched	757	687	252	1171	817
6. Note: Percent unmatched	52%	58%	38%	79%	64%

### **3. RMES selection.**

Selection of RMES (Results of Matching with external sources) candidates took place after matching was duly completed. The goal was to select RMES candidates for which a large shares of field checks could be expected to qualify for the registry. For budgetary reasons, DCS had to select all high and medium priority candidates, plus a sample of 19 percent of the low priority candidates.

Before RMES selection, a core registry was Created. Criteria for core registry

- In old DCS registry
- Responded to ASI for either 98,99,00
- Had employment of 20 or more in latest response
- Not reported closed by MOID or DCS

Operational significance: Core registry establishments weren't canvassed with the candidate survey DI-2 (RMES field check) but with the ASI-1 and/or ASI-2. Table summarizes the selection rules for RMES. The table shows that all the candidates in High-medium priority groups were selected and 240 candidates out of 1269 (19 percent) were selected using systematic sample procedure.

## Rules for Selection of RMES Sample/available for selection and selected numbers.

Core registry		
DCS old	885 983	Responded to ASI in 98, 99 or 00 w. 20+ workers. Not reported closed by MoID.
RMES Top Priority 1329		
1. BoI	- 362	Section 17 w. 20+ workers.
2. MoID	- 454	Responded to MoID 98, 99 or 00 w. 25+ workers.
3. EPF	- 513	50 or more covered workers.
RMES Medium Priority 481		
4. BoI	- 90	Section 16.
5. EPF	- 348	EPF with 20 to 49 workers.
6. DCS old	- 4	Most recent response in 95-97, w. 20+ workers, & a match to EPF or CEB.
7. DCS old	- 0	Most recent response before 95, w. 20+ workers, & a match to EPF or CEB.
8. MoID	- 6	Most recent response in 96-97, with 25+ workers, & a match to EPF or CEB.
9. MoID	- 5	No response during 1996-2000, with 25+ workers, & a match to EPF or CEB.
10. MoID	- 27	Response during 1998-2000, with 15-24 workers.
11. EPF	- 1	EPF with 15-19 workers & a match to CEB.
RMES Low Priority 240(1269)		
12. DCS old	14(14)	Response before 95, 20+ workers
13. MoID old	10(58)	Most recent response in 96-97, with 25+ workers, no match to EPF or CEB
14. EPF	23(135)	15-19 workers & no match to CEB.
15. EPF	42(233)	10-14 workers
16. CEB	151(829)	Remaining CEB, unmatched to any other.



## 5. DI-2 Candidate Survey

A Survey of Candidates for addition to the Directory to be conducted each year, to assure that directory discovers most new large/medium industry.

This survey was carried out in the field during Dec. 2002 using form DI-2.

### Success rate by source, DI-2 Survey

<u>Source</u>	<u>Successful</u>	<u>Un – Successful</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Success Rate</u>
Old DCS	3	18	21	14.3%
MOID	204	287	491	41.5%
BOI	283	173	456	62.1%
EPF	141	763	904	15.6%
CEB	50	90	140	35.7%
Total	681	1331	2012	33.8%

1. Of the 2012 candidates checked in the field, 751 qualified for DCS registry.

2. For EPF, among the 752 that did not qualify for the registry, 268 (35.6%) were non – industry and 205 (27.3%) were closed.

## 6. ASI-2

### Establishment that are Inactive, have Moved or do not Respond

When enumerators find a directory establishment that fails to the Annual Survey Questionnaire by the deadline for return of Questionnaires, enumerators can fill out form ASI-2 to report the status of the establishment.

This survey was also administered along with DI-2.

Results Table: No. of Establishments by reason of ASI-1 was not completed

Newly closed	98
Moved to unknown location	21
Could not find	37
Newly duplicate	2
Moved outside WP	9
Active non response	435
(late response)	42
<b>TOTAL ASI-2</b>	<b>647</b>

## **7. New registry for Western Province**

- **Data Structure for New Registry**
  - Name of the Est.**
  - Name of the owner**
  - Name of the contact person**
  - Position of the contact person**
  - Telephone No.(for the Est., contact person and head office)**
  - Location Address**
  - Head office Address**
  - District, DSD, MC/UC/GND**
  - Industrial estate**
  - Date of Discovery**
  - Year of started commercial Production**
  - Description of Activity(ISIC) and etc.**

## **8. Need for stage 2**

- Stage1 of the registry updating work has finished with the completion of an updated registry of the WP.
- Stage2 is needed to extend and consolidate the directory updating work in the following ways.
  1. Take advantage of the Census of Industry that DCS will conduct in this year to produce and updated industrial directory for the whole country. The census will serve as a test of completeness of stage1 updating in the Western Province.
  2. Extend stage1 software to include survey and registry management, and utilize these features to supports the Census of Industry of L & M establishments.
  3. Upgrade stage1 software in other way.
    - Prepare a module for use in district offices.
    - Document the software for users and Programmers.
    - Train DCS programmers in its use and modification.
    - Enhance the processing of source data use in annual updating in 2004.

EIN

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

ASI-2

(Choose one of the following)

**Block II. Newly Inactive**

- A. Newly Closed ( )
- B. Newly Small ( )
- C. Newly Redundant ( )

**Block III. Moved to another district ( )****Block IV. Active non-respondent ( )****DEPARTMENT OF CENSUS & STATISTICS****Survey of Inactive, Moved, Non-Responding  
Establishments -2002****Updating of Directory of Large/Medium Industry**

This form is used in connection with industry survey questionnaire ASI-1. It is filled by the enumerator for every establishment that was active last year (including those added to the directory at the last updating) but did not complete industry questionnaire ASI-1 in their district because they are now:

**INACTIVE:** they have closed, or become obsolete  
(Filled out whenever staff learns the establishment  
has become inactive)

**MOVED TO ANOTHER DISTRICT:**  
(Filled out whenever staff learns of the move)

**STILL ACTIVE BUT HAS NOT RESPONDED:**  
(Filled out at the deadline for submission of questionnaire ASI-1)



Table 1 : No. of Establishments by Reason of ASI - 1 was not Completed.

Reason of ASI - 1 was not Completed	No. of Establishments			Western Province
	Colombo	Gampaha	Kalutara	
Newly Closed	58	34	6	98
Newly Small	2	-	1	3
Newly Redundant / Obsolete	-	1	1	2
Establishment moved to within/another district	8	1	-	9
Establishment moved to unknown location	19	2	-	21
Establishment still active but not respondent	263	170	44	477
Could not found	24	13	-	37
<b>All reasons</b>	<b>374</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>647</b>

Table 2 : No. of Newly Closed Establishments by Year of Closed

Year of Closed	No. of Establishments			Western Province
	Colombo	Gampaha	Kalutara	
Before 1995	2	3	-	5
1995	-	1	-	1
1997	1	2	-	3
1998	7	3	1	11
1999	3	4	2	9
2000	10	6	1	17
2001	5	3	-	8
2002	7	7	1	15
Unknown	23	5	1	29
<b>Total</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>98</b>

Table 3 : No. of Newly Closed Establishments by Closure Status

Closure Status	No. of Establishments			Western Province
	Colombo	Gampaha	Kalutara	
Temporary	6	6	-	12
Permanent	52	28	6	86
<b>All Status</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>98</b>

Table 4 : Newly Small Establishments by Employment Group

Employment Group	No. of Establishments		Western Province
	Colombo	Kalutara	
5 - 9	1	1	2
10 - 14	1	-	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>

Table 5 : No. of Establishment that Moved to another District by Move Status

Move Status	No. of Establishments		Western Province
	Colombo	Gampaha	
New Address known - Within the District	5	-	5
New Address known - To another District	3	1	4
<b>All Status</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>

### Report for MoID

MoID has a registry of establishments comprised some 1184 establishments in the Western Province with 15 or more workers after parsing, of which 170 had been reported closed. The MoID data do not provide the precise employment, but do provide the employment categories (100+, 50-99, 25-49, 15-24, 10-14, under 10). Among the 1014 (1184-170 closed =1014) active establishments, 935 responded to the MoID Annual Survey for at least one year during 1996-2000 according to the Statistics Division of MoID, where as 121 did not.

Among the 1014 MoID establishments :

- o Some were matched with CORE as active (defined as in Old DCS registry : responded to ASI for either 98, 99, 00 : had employment of 20 or more in latest response : not reported by MoID and DCS),
- o Some were matched with other sources and were identified as closed,
- o Some were matched with the non-CORE (550 candidates) and those cases were available for field checked after the matching process and followed by RMES selection.

The 550 RMES candidates available for selection from MoID source, only 491 candidates were checked in the field through DI-2 survey. For budgetary reasons DCS had to select 491 MoID candidates out of 550 available for RMES selection.

In terms of success rate, MoID had the moderate scores, 50 percent.

Of the 491 candidates from MoID source checked in the field for Western Province, 245 are active establishments with 20 and more workers. Among the 246 that did not qualify, 64 were closed, 53 had shifted into non-industry, 37 could not be found, 46 were small (fewer than 20 workers) 39 were located in a district other than the one where they were sought, and 7 were temporary closed and to be re checked next year.

The MoID establishment that were field visited and so which ones were or were not active are available at DCS. DCS would give this to MoID