

**Cautionary note:**

The Community Survey results were released on 24 October 2007. After the evaluation of the data by the Stats Council, the Community Survey was found to be comparable in many aspects with other Stats SA surveys, censuses and other external sources. However, there are some areas of concern where Statistics South Africa is urging users to be more cautious when using the Community Survey data.

The main concerns are:

- The institutional population is merely an approximation to 2001 numbers and it is not new data.
- The measure of unemployment in the Community Survey is higher and less reliable due to the differences in questions asked relative to the normal Labour Force Surveys.
- The income includes unreasonably high income for children due to presumably misinterpretation of the question, e.g. listing parent's income for the child.
- The distribution of households by province has very little congruence with the General Household Survey or Census 2001.
- The interpretation of grants or those receiving grants need to be done with caution.
- Since the Community Survey is based on random sample and not a Census, any interpretation should be understood to have some random fluctuation in data, particularly concerning the small population for some cells. The user should understand that the figures are within a certain interval of confidence.

Users should be aware of these statements as part of the cautionary notes:

- The household estimates at municipal level differ slightly from the national and provincial estimates in terms of the household variables profile;
- The Community Survey has considered as an add-on an approximation of population in areas not covered by the survey, such as institutions and recreational areas. This approximation of people could not provide the number of those households (i.e. institutions). Thus, there is no household record for those people approximated as living out of CS scope;
- Any cross-tabulation giving small numbers at municipal level should be interpreted with caution such as taking small value in given table's cell as likely over or under estimation of the true population;
- No reliance should be placed on numbers for variables broken down at municipal level (i.e. age, population group etc.). However, the aggregated total number per municipality provides more reliable estimates;

- Usually a zero total figure (excluding those in institutions) reflects the fact that no sample was realised and in such cases this is likely to be a significant underestimate of the true population.
- As an extension from the above statement, in a number of instances the number realised in the sample, though not zero, was very small (maybe as low as a single individual) and in some cases had to be re-weighted by a very large factor (maximum nearly 800 for housing weight and over 1000 for person weight).
- As a further consequence, small sub-populations are likely to be heavily over- or under-represented at a household level in the data.
- It should be noted that the estimates were done with the use of the de-facto population and not the de-jure population. The final presentation of results is presented on the de-jure population.