



ONC(ONC(SC))00/20

ONE NUMBER CENSUS STEERING COMMITTEE

One Number Census Management Issues Update

1. This paper contains issues associated with the management and development of the One Number Census (ONC) and Census Coverage Survey (CCS) including:
 - a) Risk Registers for the ONC and CCS; and
 - b) A high level description of the ONC timetable and its place in the overall census timetable.

2. **The Steering Committee is asked to:**
 - a) **note the status of the risk registers; and**
 - b) **note the status of the ONC timetable; and**
 - c) **provide any comments at the meeting on the 28th June 2000.**

**Marie Cruddas
Census Division
Office for National Statistics
Room 4200W
Segensworth Road
Titchfield
Fareham
HANTS
PO15 5RR**

June 2000

One Number Census Management Issues Update

Marie Cruddas

1. Introduction

This paper is an update of ONS(ONC(SC))00/09 and covers issues associated with the management and development of the One Number Census (ONC) and Census Coverage Survey (CCS). Included are:

- The revised Risk Registers for the ONC and CCS; and
- A high level description of the ONC timetable and its place in the overall census timetable.

2. Updated Risk Registers for the ONC and CCS

Introduction

The attached tables identify risks and issues associated with a) the development and implementation of the One Number Census process and b) the Census Coverage Survey.

The risk registers have been updated since the last Steering Committee meeting to reflect progress that has been achieved in the interim and were discussed at the last ONC Project Board held on 22nd May.

Changes to the ONC Risk Register are summarised in the table below. For the CCS Register changes are indicated in the right hand column of the Register.

ONC Risk Register

Changes to the ONC Risk Register since the last meeting of the Steering Committee on 9th February 2000

Risk	Progress/Changes since last Steering Committee
Risk Registers	<p>The Development and Implementation Registers have been merged to remove overlap between the two and reorganised under the general headings:</p> <p>CONSULTATION; TIMING OF THE DELIVERY OF THE ONC; METHODOLOGY/EVALUATION; QUALITY; DEVELOPMENT; RESOURCES; IMPLEMENTATION and ONC OUTPUTS.</p>
<p>Consultation Risks 1&2. Confidence in the ONC/ Consultation with Users</p>	<p>The six risks in the previous register were repetitive. These have been streamlined and are covered in two risks. Plan new Guide in 2000 to enable understanding of final methodology and explicitly address issues raised in previous consultation. Detailed methodology paper for RSS meeting end 2000.</p>
<p>Methodology/Evaluation General Methodology</p>	<p>It has now been decided what to do about Communal Establishments and estimation is considered as part of general estimation methodology. Therefore this risk has been removed.</p>
<p>Risk 4. ONC methodology fails due to inadequate evaluation/methodology.</p>	<p>Test of all integrated Census processing planned for late 2000.</p>
<p>Risk 6. Matching methodology inadequately trialled</p>	<p>Evaluation of clerical matching of rehearsal data is reported in ONS(ONC(SC))00/14.</p>
<p>ONC LA Estimation Methodology</p>	<p>LAD estimation techniques developed and tested – reported in ONS(ONC(SC))/00/03. Risk of not developing the methodology has been removed.</p>
<p>QA Process</p>	<p>Information on the quality of national level demographic estimates is now available so the risk of it not being so is removed.</p>
<p>Development of weighting methodology</p>	<p>As this is not being developed it has been removed.</p>
<p>ONC Imputation</p>	<p>The probability of not developing the imputation methodology has been reduced to Low (from Medium) An update is presented in ONS(ONC(SC))00/17.</p>

Risk	Progress/Changes since last Steering Committee
Quality Risk 11.	This has been reduced to Medium – following assessment in CCS Risk Register.
Risk 13.	This risk reflecting possibility of processed data not being of sufficient quality to support the ONC process has been added.
Development Risk 14	Test of all integrated Census processing planned for late 2000.
Resources Risk 15.	Resources not available to develop, support and run ONC process – probability to High, from Medium, probability to reflect current concerns. Recruitment is being conducted with view to building in resilience for the future.
Implementation Risk 21	Following discussion at the ONC Project Board this has been changed from a risk that National Demographic estimates do not (approximately) equal the ONC estimates to a risk that there is not contingency in place.
ONC Outputs Risk 25	This has been re-written to reflect the fact that the risk is that we will not have a policy for informing users about the amount of imputed data rather than one of not being able to distinguish collected from imputed data in output. A policy for informing users of the amount of imputation is being taken forward. Thus the risk has been reduced to Low, Medium.

RISK No.	DESCRIPTION OF RISK	PROB.	IMPACT	WHO	ACTION
-----------------	----------------------------	--------------	---------------	------------	---------------

1. CONSULTATION

1.	Failure to carry out adequate consultation and to communicate the concept of the ONC to internal and external users resulting in customer dissatisfaction.	Low	High	Graham Jones Andy Teague Marie Cruddas	Consultation papers circulated 1998 and 1999. Responses received and summaries presented to Census Advisory Group and Census News. Regular updates given to Advisory Groups. Presence on Census website.
2.	Failure to communicate the (fairly complex) methodology to users. Thus undermining user confidence in Census results, P&VS population estimates and National Statistics.	Low	Medium	Andy Teague Ian Diamond Marie Cruddas	ONC workshop, Leeds 1998. ONC workshops held (April/May 1999) as part of Census Roadshows. Simple Guide to ONC circulated to users in 1999. Plan new Guide in 2000 to enable understanding of final methodology and explicitly address issues raised in previous consultation. Detailed methodology paper for RSS meeting end 2000.

2. TIMING OF THE DELIVERY OF THE ONC

3.	The ONC process will involve delays to the 'usual' timetable that will not be acceptable for customers of Census outputs.	Medium	Medium	Andy Teague	Are aware of user requirements with respect to proposed methodology and timing. Co-ordination of the development of all Census processing systems is ongoing.
----	---	--------	--------	-------------	---

3. METHODOLOGY/EVALUATION

3.1 General

4	ONC methodology fails due to inadequate evaluation/methodology. Effect depends on level and point of failure. Undermines user confidence and damages ONS reputation	Low	High	Andy Teague Marie Cruddas	Evaluate and learn from Rehearsal. Evaluation plan produced ONS(ONC(SC))00/06. Development of ONC process via simulation methodology to ensure practicality. Test of all integrated Census processing planned for late 2000.
---	---	-----	------	------------------------------	---

3.2 Matching

5.	Matching methodology inadequately developed e.g. high false match rate. Will have an adverse effect on DSE	Medium	High	Jennet Woolford	Research to minimise this risk. Work ongoing. Consultation with matching experts.
----	--	--------	------	-----------------	---

RISK No.	DESCRIPTION OF RISK	PROB.	IMPACT	WHO	ACTION
6.	Matching methodology inadequately trialled and so cannot adequately match Census and C.C.S data	Medium	High	Jennet Woolford	Plan full trial of matching procedures in DR ONS(ONC(SC))98/14. Evaluation of clerical matching reported in ONS(ONC(SC))00/14.
3.3 QA					
7.	Quality of administrative data is not sufficient for ONC QA	Low	Low	Emma Wright	Work ongoing into utility of admin. records.
8.	An explicit assessment of the accuracy of demographic estimates at the sub national level is not available.	Medium	Medium	Roma Chappell	Some assessment of quality will be made. Work is ongoing to define requirements.
9.	QA systems not developed and tested.	Medium	Low	Emma Wright	Work ongoing in consultation with I. Diamond and S Simpson. Resources need to be allocated to achieve this.
3.4 Imputation					
10.	Methodology for imputation of households and individuals not developed. Full ONC not possible.	Low	Medium	Marie Cruddas	Methods currently being investigated. Communicate to customers the value of ONC LAD estimates for resource allocation purposes if full ONC not possible. See ONS(ONC(SC))98/15. Updated in ONS(ONC(SC))00/17.

4. QUALITY

11.	Failure of the CCS to find sufficient of the people missed in the Census. (rough estimate is to find two thirds of those missed in the Census).	Medium	High	John Dixie	Design CCS to minimise this risk – ONC research designed to reduce likelihood. Deal with in contingency strategy.
12.	Mis-reporting of information in the CCS (e.g. postcode, date of birth, etc.) will result in difficulty in matching to Census data. Therefore inaccurate population estimates.	Low	Medium	John Dixie Jennet Woolford	Research designed to minimise this risk.
13.	Poor quality of the captured data results in difficulty in matching.	Medium	Low/Med	Andy Teague	Assessment of quality being made from the Rehearsal. Will lead to increase in clerical matching and possible delays.

RISK No.	DESCRIPTION OF RISK	PROB.	IMPACT	WHO	ACTION
-----------------	----------------------------	--------------	---------------	------------	---------------

5. DEVELOPMENT

14.	Failure to communicate the concept and requirements of the ONC to Processing and IS teams. This will result in difficulties in development of the ONC and possibly an inability to deliver a system to time.	Low	High	Marie Cruddas Jennet Woolford	Ongoing communication with Census, processing contractor and IS teams. IS personnel dedicated to ONC. Test of all integrated Census processing planned for late 2000.
-----	--	-----	------	----------------------------------	--

6. RESOURCES

15.	Resources not available to develop, support and run ONC process.	High	High	Graham Jones Andy Teague Marie Cruddas	Recruitment and retention of personnel with specialised statistical and IT skills is a key issue. Recruitment is being conducted with view to building in resilience for the future.
-----	--	------	------	--	--

7. IMPLEMENTATION

16.	Timetable slippage which impacts on Census Outputs and population estimates. Undermines user confidence and damages ONS reputation.	Medium	Medium	Andy Teague Marie Cruddas	Release of agreed LAD estimates prior to data. Timing assessments as part of the Rehearsal evaluation.
7.1 Matching					
17.	Quality of matching not adequate and so DSE/regression may not be possible.	Low	High	Jennet Woolford	Research to minimise this risk Contingency plan. Contingency strategy outlined in ONS(ONC(SC))99/03A.
7.2 Estimation					
18	Not possible to make estimates to the level required (LA and below). Minimum aim of ONC not possible.	Low	High	Marie Cruddas	Robust standard methods adopted as far as possible. Prototype and test fully. ONS(ONC(SC))00/03
7.3 QA					
19	The National Level demographic estimates are not available on time so there will be a delay in finalising figures.	Low	Medium	Roma Chappell	P&VS plan to ensure adequate resources are available to produce estimates.
20	The sub national demographic estimates are not available on time. Possible delay in output and in providing 2001 population	Medium	Low	Roma Chappell	P & VS plan to ensure adequate resources are available to produce estimates.

RISK No.	DESCRIPTION OF RISK	PROB.	IMPACT	WHO	ACTION
	estimates to DETR for RSG purposes.				
21	No contingency in place if National Demographic estimates do not (approximately) equal ONC estimates.	Medium	High	Andy Teague Marie Cruddas Roma Chappell	QA Strategy: QA strategy outlined in ONS(ONC(SC))00/04.
22	ONC Estimates are not plausible in some areas.	Medium	Low	Marie Cruddas Roma Chappell	QA Strategy: QA strategy outlined in ONS(ONC(SC))00/04.
7.4 Imputation					
23.	Numbers do not add up to the 'One Number' and so ONC not achieved.	Low	Medium	Marie Cruddas	Imputation methodology developed to ensure this does not happen.

8. ONC OUTPUTS

24.	LA estimates not acceptable to LAs. Customer confidence lost.	Low	High	Graham Jones Judith Walton	Consult and inform as much as possible. Need to develop a strategy for agreement and release.
25.	Inadequate information about the amount of imputed data available to users.	Low	Medium	Andy Teague	Policy for informing users of the amount of imputation is being developed.

CCS RISK MANAGEMENT REGISTER – VERSION 4 – 15 JUNE 2000

Changes since Version 2 have been highlighted. The previous assessment is shown in parentheses.

Risk No.	Level	Risk	Impact of Risk	Probability H M L	Impact H M L	Who Acts	When Exposed	Action/Approach
General Management								
1.	Pro-gramme	Failure to retain appropriate CCS headquarters staff	Inability to conduct Survey effectively – poor results	(M/H) M	(M/H) M	Andy Teague	Ongoing	The CCS team has been expanded, in two stages, to give a measure of resilience to staff resigning. Adjust staff postings to minimise overall damage and draw on total Census Stats. capability
2.	Project	Lack of communication by CCS team to Census Division	Difficulty with Survey Support leading to poor results	L	M	CCS Work Package Managers	Ongoing	Regular interface meetings are held and a keen watch is kept on key dates. Track record of dates being met.
3.	Project	Inadequate budget for CCS.	Reduced operations, which may not meet ONC requirements	M	(H) M	John Dixie	Jan 2000	Review of planning assumptions in the light of the CCS Rehearsal experience indicates many items are likely to come out on budget. Consult ONC on options for saving money if funds have to be limited in order to minimise the impact.

Risk No.	Level	Risk	Impact of Risk	Probability H M L	Impact H M L	Who Acts	When Exposed	Action/Approach
4.	Project	Failure of field procedures during Rehearsal CCS	Less reliable conclusions about procedures for the CCS	L	(H) M	John Dixie	May/ June 1999	Most evaluation now done and indicates that most processes were sound. Further testing has resulted in revised procedures, which should reduce the risk of missing people and the risk of counting them more than once.
5.	Pro-gramme	Delivery of Rehearsal data from LM late	CCS Project cannot carry out a full evaluation	Risk removed			September 1999	The data has now been delivered. Analyses not dependent on data captured by LM now completed. Analyses dependent on LM data rescheduled
6.	Pro-gramme	Products on which the CCS depends delivered late by other Census projects	Delay in the Survey – delay in CCS data base for the ONC Project	L	M	Managers of the other Projects	Ongoing	Build in floats on all critical activities. Liaise actively with other Census projects. Monitor delivery of equivalent services to Census to obtain early warning of any slippage
7.	Pro-gramme	Damage to ONS reputation if CCS is not successful	Covered in the Risk Register for the ONC Project					

Risk No.	Level	Risk	Impact of Risk	Probability H M L	Impact H M L	Who Acts	When Exposed	Action/Approach
Conducting the CCS								
8.	Pro-gramme	General Election called in 2001	Possible impact on coverage, with a potential lack of co-operation from the public. Possible contention for staff.	(M) H	(M) L	Mike Rose CCS Training and Recruit- ment WP Managers	May 2001	Census publicity to emphasise the differences from the election, canvassing etc. Incorporate modules in CCS field staff training on how to handle this issue. General Election could clash with the CCS.
9.	Pro-gramme	Extension of Census follow up	Delay the start of the CCS Fieldwork causing staffing problems, poorer coverage of students, more problems with movers, and poorer recall by respondents	(M) L	H	Alex Clark	May 2001	The best strategy for the Census overall is being considered. It is hoped that it will be agreed that there are no circumstances in which it would be advantageous to prolong the Census follow-up in selected areas, in which case this risk will be eliminated.
10.	Project	Failure to attract enough field staff of adequate quality for the CCS.	Lack of adequate persistence during the fieldwork resulting in lower coverage.	(H) M	(M/H) M	CCS Recruit- ment WP Manager	Oct. 2000 – April 2001	Focus groups have been conducted to ascertain what attracts people to the Interviewer job and findings being built into the recruitment arrangements. Advice received from COI on recruitment publicity indicates we should have sufficient funds for adequate advertising. Analysis is in progress to ensure workloads and pay are in line with the going rate in each labour market area.
11.	Project	2001 CCS Field Staff	Poorer performance –	(H)	(H)	CCS	February	The number of field staff required in an

Risk No.	Level	Risk	Impact of Risk	Probability H M L	Impact H M L	Who Acts	When Exposed	Action/Approach
		may not be the same quality as in previous tests	reduced response rate	M	M	Recruitment WP Manager If Census decisions constrain the CCS, Alex Clark Andy Teague	– April 2001	area will be less than in the Rehearsal. Improved advertising is expected to generate more applications from which to choose staff. Rehearsal recruitment criteria and recruitment training have been evaluated. Training programme has been started for all HQ recruiters and trainers, including validation.
12.	Project	Enumerators resign before they move to work as Interviewers on the CCS	Insufficient Interviewers	L	(M/H) L	Rod Massingham John Dixie (Contingency)	April/ May 2001	This was not a significant problem in the Rehearsal despite complaints about the workload of the Enumerators. Census is revising their arrangements for staff motivation. Plan to have reserve and contingency staff. Possibly in each Team Manager area limit the proportion of Interviewers who have been Enumerators, if feasible.
13.	Project	Field staff recruitment	There is a limit of 48 hours worked per week in the Working Time Directive. If a disclaimer does not allow this to be exceeded we would not be able to recruit people who already	(New risk) L	(New risk) H	CCS Recruitment WP Manager	To June 2001	The implications of the Working Time Directive are still being assessed by Census. However, it appears likely that we will be able to ask field staff to sign a disclaimer so this risk can be eliminated. In the Rehearsal around 35% of the Interviewers also had a full-time job.

Risk No.	Level	Risk	Impact of Risk	Probability H M L	Impact H M L	Who Acts	When Exposed	Action/Approach
			have a full-time job. Some part-timers would also be excluded					
14.	Project	CCS Fieldwork	When the CCS sample is drawn the amount of fieldwork required is found to be significantly greater than expected. Additional field effort required, at additional cost.	(New risk) M	(New risk) L	CCS Workload Planning WP Manager	Jan. 2000	Decide to recruit additional field staff.
15.	Project	The CCS budget	Due to the Minimum Wage Legislation we will have to pay additional money if the fieldwork requires significantly more hours than planned.	(New risk) L	(New risk) M	CCS Pay WP Manager John Dixie	May/ June 2001	We will plan the work as precisely as possible using the data from the Rehearsal, and manage hours spent on the fieldwork more tightly. It appears unlikely that the minimum wage limit will be reached. We will monitor hours worked.
16.	Project	Inadequate training for field staff	Poorly conducted CCS – reduced response	L	L	CCS Training WP Manager	Nov 2000– April 2001	Robust plans developed for training in 2001. All HQ trainers are undertaking appropriate training leading to an NVQ. Field staff training will be delivered as directly as possible to maximise quality. SSD expertise will be built into the training.

Risk No.	Level	Risk	Impact of Risk	Probability H M L	Impact H M L	Who Acts	When Exposed	Action/Approach
								Quality Control reports will be made on Interviewer training and remedial action taken if required. Team Managers will observe their Interviewers throughout the fieldwork to ensure that they do not drift away from the correct procedure.
17.	Project	Incorrect duration of the CCS fieldwork	Too short – coverage achieved too low for ONC Too long – money spent on field staff pay unnecessarily	Risk removed				There is not much flexibility in the duration of the CCS fieldwork. Lockheed Martin requires TNT to begin collection of the CCS forms on 1 July. Research has now been focussed on sizing workloads so that the required coverage is achieved in the scheduled period.
Old 16.	Project	Postcode maps not suitable for purpose.		Risk removed				Planned maps and contingency maps both fully tested and both meet the business requirement.
18.	Project	The CCS Team Reporting And Communications System (TRACS) not available by the time required	Impact on collection of timely and accurate management information leading to weak management of CCS.	(M) L	(H) L	GROS development team – Ed. Turnbull	Sep 2000	The requirement has been fully specified and considered by the development team. The prototype of the first module of TRACS has been developed and is being tested by the CCS Team. The project timetable has contingency time built in for both development and testing.

Risk No.	Level	Risk	Impact of Risk	Probability H M L	Impact H M L	Who Acts	When Exposed	Action/Approach
19.	Project	Technical problems with TRACS	TRACS does not work effectively	(New risk) L	(New risk) M	GROS development team – Ed. Turnbull	Jan.-June 2000	Contract for equipment will include rapid response hardware support. There will be a helpline provided by GROS for user support. The system design does not require any specially written software to be loaded on the microcomputers out in the field. All databases are held only on the system server, which will be in a secure environment. A contingency plan will be developed for all key activities in the event of local or temporary system failure.
20.	Project	Failure to find sufficient number of the people missed by the Census by insufficient contact with and co-operation by the public	Failure of CCS to meet ONC requirements – ONC not carried down to the lowest level or estimates less precise than planned or biased.	(H) M	(H) M	John Dixie Marie Cruddas (Contingency)	May/ June 2001	Tighter management control procedures developed for the fieldwork, to detect any problems and initiate contingency action in time to raise contact rates. ONC initiate contingency plan.
21.	Project	Failure to collect accurate data in the CCS	Difficulty in matching to Census data – too few matches found – ONC not carried down to the lowest planned level or estimates less precise than planned or biased.	(M) L	(H) L – survey responses H – if revised form	CCS Training WP Manager Graham Jones (form id)	May/ June 2001	The responses to the survey questions in the Rehearsal appear to have been of good quality. The form identifier has been reviewed and a change has been proposed to achieve high accuracy and minimise

Risk No.	Level	Risk	Impact of Risk	Probability H M L	Impact H M L	Who Acts	When Exposed	Action/Approach
					identifier is not implemented			queries during processing. See also ONC report on the robustness of the matching process.
22.	Project	Obtaining proxy information about people who have refused liable to a legal challenge.	Bad press, and risk of losing the case.	(New risk) ?	(New risk) L/M	Ian White	May-June 2000	The legal position is being checked.
Methodology								
23.	Project	Procedures used in CCS Rehearsal may not work well on a larger scale for the 2001 CCS	Poor results	(M) L	(H) L	John Dixie	January – June 2001	Plans developed to build in all success factors from CCS Rehearsal to ensure success is repeated, including the requirements for scaling up the operation. The size of the CCS Operational team has been increased, in two stages.
24.	Project	Need for substantial further testing of CCS processes.	Lack of time puts preparations for 2001 at risk.	L	(H) L	John Dixie	Early 2000	An additional test was carried out in March and has been evaluated. The changes were found to work well. A final confirmatory test was mounted in June. Research findings by ONS and other organisations are being incorporated in the plans for the CCS.

Risk No.	Level	Risk	Impact of Risk	Probability H M L	Impact H M L	Who Acts	When Exposed	Action/Approach
CCS Acceptability								
25.	Project	Public finds CCS intrusive or repetitive	Lack of Public co-operation – reduced data available for ONC – public dissatisfied	L	L	John Dixie	May 2001	Testing has demonstrated that the interview is generally acceptable. Plan the interviews to be as short and simple as possible Prepare Field Staff to answer likely questions Offer a local rate information phone line with staff trained to try to persuade people to co-operate.
26.	Pro-gramme	Political opinion swings against the Census or the CCS	Low response rate – reduced data available for ONC Public dissatisfied	L	M	Mike Rose	January – June 2001	Ensure Ministers, MPs, local elected representatives and the media are well briefed at the national and local levels.

3. Updated timetable for ONC

The timetable for the ONC is being developed in common with all Census downstream processes. Initial work has been carried out to draw up an illustrative timetable but further development will only be possible once all of the downstream processes have been rehearsed at the end of 2000.

Given below is a high level overview of the general timetable for key census outputs, a description of the place of the ONC within the overall census processing timetable and a discussion of the effect of the ONC process on the overall census timetable.

Deadlines for Key Census Outputs

- Census counts (by age, sex and Local Authority) are required to rebase the mid-year population estimates – these must be delivered to P&VS Division (England & Wales) by **mid August 2002** (i.e. 16 months after Census Day)
- A range of Census counts at Output Area level are required for standard spending assessment purposes – these must be delivered to DETR by **March 2003** (i.e. 23 months after Census Day).
- All other standard outputs (including data for Eurostat) are required by **June 2003** (i.e. 26 months after Census Day).

Overall Census Processing Timetable

Lockheed Martin Processing

All Census data will be captured and coded by Lockheed Martin **between June 2001 and March 2002** (all data must be delivered to the Census Offices by 31 March 2002). Data will be processed Design Group by Design Group in a pre-specified order, and there are intermediate contract dates by which set percentages of Design Groups must be completed. Census data for the first Design Group will be delivered to ONS at the beginning of July 2001.

Processing by Census Offices

Downstream processing of data conducted by the Census Offices will be conducted **between July 2001** (when the first captured and coded data is received from Lockheed Martin) **and August 2002** (when counts are required to rebase the population estimates). Downstream processing consists of:

- Edit & Imputation (i.e. imputation for item non-response);
- Data Validation
- One Number Census (see more detailed timetable below);
- Disclosure Control; and
- Outputs

(N.B. Disclose Control & Outputs are not required to meet the August 2002 deadline, but do need to be completed to meet the March 2003 and June 2003 deadlines)

All downstream processes will be run in parallel (i.e. once a Design Group has completed stage 1, it can move on to stage 2 whilst the next Design Group goes through stage 1).

ONC Timetable

2001

August: Census and CCS data for first Design Group matched.
(Note: matching can not be completed for a Design Group until Census data is available for all contiguous Design Groups)

September: ONC estimates produced for first Design Group (by sex, age and local authority).

- (i) Quality Assurance (QA) of estimates for first Design Group; and
 - (ii) Imputation of households/persons for first Design Group.
- (Note: These two processes will be run at the same time, with estimation and imputation being re-run if shown necessary by the QA)

It is currently estimated that it will take approximately 12 days, on average, to complete the ONC processes for a single Design Group (this time roughly being evenly split between matching and estimation/QA/imputation). Matching, Estimation, and QA/Imputation will continue for each Design Group in turn, with all processes running in parallel. This continues until...

2002

May: Matching of Census and CCS data for final Design Group completed.

June: ONC estimation for final Design Group completed.

QA and Imputation for final Design Group completed.

July/August: Sum Design Group estimates to produce national ONC estimate.

Quality Assure national estimates, revising estimation and re-running imputation if necessary.

Implications of ONC to overall Census timetable

Census counts to rebase population estimates:

If the One Number Census processes were omitted from the downstream processing programme, it would probably be possible to produce census counts by age, sex and local authority for all of England & Wales by June 2002 (i.e. 2-3 months earlier). However, estimates of underenumeration would still be needed to produce rebased population

estimates, and so it is unlikely that the August 2002 deadline could be met any earlier. (Note: The first national results from the 1991 Census were made available in September 1992, slightly later than the timescale proposed for the 2001 Census, including the One Number Census.)

Other Census Outputs:

Once all the downstream processes are completed, it will take approximately a month to produce the final output database. If the ONC was not conducted, this output database would probably be completed in June 2002 (rather than October 2002) and hence all other Census Outputs would be available roughly 4 months earlier.