



ONS(ONC(SC))99/03

ONE NUMBER CENSUS STEERING COMMITTEE

One Number Census Management Issues Update

1. This paper discusses several 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;
 - b) Development/implementation timetables for the ONC Process; and;
 - c) The draft QA/Contingency strategies.

2. **The Steering Committee are asked to:**
 - a) **note the Risk Registers;**
 - b) **note the status of the timetables;**
 - c) **agree the QA strategy; and;**
 - d) **provide any comments at the meeting on the 1 July 1999, or in writing by 15 July 1999.**

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

June 1999

One Number Census Management Issues Update

Marie Cruddas

1. Introduction

This paper is an update of ONS(ONC(SC))98/11 and covers several issues associated with the management and development of the One Number Census (ONC) and Census Coverage Survey (CCS). It includes:

- Risk Registers for the ONC and CCS.
- An update on the status of the development/implementation timetables for the ONC Process
- The draft contingency/QA strategy

2. Risk Registers: Updated for the One Number Census and the Census Coverage Survey

Introduction

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

The original ONC risk register has been updated. Following this meeting the risk registers will be updated and re-structured so that they are consistent with other risk registers within Census.

Overview

The primary purpose of the ONC is to provide Local Authority District (LAD) level estimates by age-sex groups adjusted for undercount by:

a) Census Coverage Survey (CCS) - This will be designed to produce population estimates for large areas (large LADs or groups of smaller LADs) for a specified level of precision, allowing for variability in age-sex and hard to count groups and ensuring coverage across all LADs. To make direct estimates for all LADs would require a much larger sample size.

b) Quality assuring census-based estimates at a) with the demographic estimates produced by Population and Vital Statistics Division using rolled forward 1981 Census data and aggregate level administrative records (Health records, births and deaths etc).

c) Using the CCS data to model down to small areas in order to derive probabilities of individuals being missed. These can then be used to impute a complete database that can be tabulated as required.

Assumptions/prerequisites

- Census day is 29th April 2001.
- The Census aims at a complete enumeration.
- Enumerators will be recruited in all areas.
- The Census is carried out successfully and a Census Coverage Survey (CCS) also takes place.
- The CCS takes place 3-4 weeks after Census day.
- Consultation will indicate that users require adjusted estimates to at least LAD level and will accept a delay in their publication.

Changes in the risk registers since last meeting of the Steering Committee, 13 November 1998

A1 – Development and testing risks

| Risk | Changes made |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| 1.1 General Management: Confidence | A summary of the responses to the Consultation Paper has been prepared for the Advisory Groups and Census News. ONC Workshops have been held. A ONC Guide has been circulated to users. |
| 1.3 General Management: Methodology | The methodology for including Communal Establishments has been added to the risk register. An evaluation plan has been produced for the Census Rehearsal. |
| 2.1 Processing the CCS: Methodology | The responsibilities for risks relating to matching have been passed to Jennet Baxter. It appears that there is no legal reason why names cannot be captured from the Census and CCS forms. The risk relating to Scotland not carrying out a rehearsal CCS has been removed from the register. |
| 4.1 Quality Assurance: Quality | The section 'Making Demographic estimates' has been removed, and the risks contained within are now included in the Quality Assurance section, with some alterations. The likelihood of the quality of national demographic sources being inadequate has been reduced from medium to low. Research to produce uncertainty estimates on the national demographic estimates is included in paper ONS(ONC(SC))99/05. The likelihood of the quality of sub-national demographic sources being inadequate has been reduced from high to low. Some assessment of the quality of the sub-national demographic sources will be possible. |
| 5 Adjusting the Database: Methodology | An additional contingency if the imputation methodology is not developed has been added. This is to communicate to customers the value of the ONC LAD estimates if the full ONC is not possible. |

B1 – Implementation risks

| Risk | Changes made |
|---|---|
| 1.1 General Management: Confidence | Paper ONS(ONC(SC))99/03A has been produced |
| 2.1 CCS and the ONC: Quality | The responsibilities for risks relating to matching have been passed to Jennet Baxter. |
| 3.1 Processing the CCS: Interface and Timing - Capture | Rod Massingham has been removed from the list of those responsible and Simon King has been added in his place. |
| 3.1 Processing the CCS: Interface and Timing – Matching | The responsibilities for risks relating to matching have been passed to Jennet Baxter. The risk that people and software are not available to carry out the matching has been added to the register. |
| 3.2 Processing the CCS: Quality | The risk that the quality of the matching is inadequate has been added to the register. |
| 4.2 Design Group and LAD estimation: Timing | An action has been added to agree with DETR and DoH etc. what data they require and by when. This is being pursued in conjunction with the Census Output Project. |
| 5.1 Quality Assurance: Timing | P&VS are planning to ensure that adequate resources are available to produce estimates. A secondary effect has been added to the risk of demographic estimates not being available on time. This effect is that there will be a delay in providing 2001 population estimates to DETR for RSG purposes. |
| 5.2 Quality Assurance: Quality | The risk that the ONC estimates differ from administrative data has been added to the register. |

C1 – CCS Risk Register

The CCS Risk Register has been substantially revised and updated to match the format used for the One Number Census register.

| Risk | Changes made |
|-----------------------|--|
| 1. General Management | The following risks have been added: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The importance of the CCS is not communicated to Census Division, ONS and the Public.• Failure to integrate with the IS Strategy.• Failure of the field procedures during the CCS Rehearsal.• The products on which the CCS depends are delivered late.• Damage to ONS' reputation if the CCS is not successful. |
| 2. Conducting the CCS | The risks relating to insufficient fieldstaff have been expanded to include the recruitment of ONS Census Staff, retention of ONS Census staff, recruitment of Team Managers and recruitment of Interviewers. Note that these contain within them the advertising and pay risks. The following risks have been added: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The timing of the CCS is not right – too early or too late.• The postcode maps are not suitable.• CCS fails to find sufficient number of the people missed by the census.• Inaccurate/missing data collected by Interviewers from the. |
| 3. Methodology | The following risks have been added: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The procedures used in Test CCS not working in the CCS Rehearsal.• The fieldstaff may be of a different quality in the Rehearsal than in the Brent Pilot. The likelihood of census enumerators resigning before that move to the CCS has been reduced from Medium to Low. The impact of this risk has been reduced from High to Low. |
| 4. Political Factors | The risks on the previous register have been merged into the risk of there being political opinion against the Census or CCS. The risk that a General Election in 2001 causes Census and CCS to be put back by 2 weeks has been added. |

A2. Development and Testing Risks

| RISK | LIKELIHOOD | IMPACT OF RISK | EFFECTS | SECONDARY EFFECTS | RESPONSIBILITY | CONTINGENCY/ ACTION | STATUS |
|--|------------|-----------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1. GENERAL MANAGEMENT | | | | | | | |
| 1.1 Confidence Failure to communicate the concept of a ONC to users: Internal ONS External | Low Low | Medium Large | { Customer dissatisfaction | | { ONC Project team: Ian Diamond, Marie Cruddas | Consultation paper and further consultation to ensure methods fully understood. | Responses received to consultation paper - summary prepared for advisory groups and Census News. |
| Raising expectations too high | Medium | Medium | Customer and internal dissatisfaction | Ineffective expenditure | | | ONC Workshops held (April/May 1999) as part of Census Roadshows. |
| Consultation not adequate | Low | Small | Users criticise method | Undermines Census and mid-year population estimates | | | |
| Failure to provide adequate advice to users (as methodology involves degree of complexity). | Low | Small | Undermines user confidence in Census results | Undermines user confidence in P&VS population estimates | Andy Teague Ian Diamond Marie Cruddas | Simple guide to ONC | Guide to ONC (1999) circulated to Users |
| Damage to ONS reputation if ONC not successful. | Medium | Medium | Undermines user confidence, primarily in Census | Undermines user confidence in other ONS business areas, particularly P&VS | Tim Jones Graham Jones Andy Teague | Develop evaluation strategy for DR and apply findings for 2001 to avoid this. | |

| RISK | LIKELIHOOD | IMPACT OF RISK | EFFECTS | SECONDARY EFFECTS | RESPONSIBILITY | CONTINGENCY/ ACTION | STATUS |
|---|-------------------|-----------------------|---|---|---|--|---|
| 1.2 Interfaces Failure to communicate the concept and requirements of ONC to: Processing CCS IS | Low | Large | Difficulties in development of ONC Inability to deliver system | | Marie Cruddas Simon King Census Project Managers | Ongoing communication with Census, Processing contractor and IS teams | Ongoing |
| 1.3 Methodology Methodology for including Communal Establishments (CEs) inadequate/not developed | Medium | Medium | Difficulty in producing estimates of undercoverage in CEs | Undermine User confidence in ONC estimates | Marie Cruddas Ian Diamond | Develop methodology using Census Rehearsal data | See paper ONS(ONC(SC))99/04 |
| Failure of the ONC methodology during Census Rehearsal. | Medium | Large | Need to reassess methodology for 2001. Might not be possible to test changes before 2001. | Inappropriate methodology adopted for 2001. | ONC Project Team | Evaluate and learn from DR. | Evaluation and plan produced ONS(ONC(SC))99/04 |
| 1.4 Timing The process will involve delays to usual timetable that will not be acceptable for customers of population estimates | Medium | Medium | Delay which does not impinge on Revenue Support Grant (RSG) is acceptable | Delay to RSG use diminishes need for Census | Graham Jones Judith Walton Andy Teague Roma Chappell | Aware of current user requirements with respect to proposed methodology and timing | Input waited from Census Processing and Census Output. ONC timetable to be updated. |
| 2. PROCESSING THE CCS | | | | | | | |
| 2.1 Methodology Matching methodology inadequately developed eg high false match rate | Medium | Large | Can not adequately match Census and CCS data | Adverse effect on DSE | Jennet Baxter | Research to minimise this risk | Work ongoing. Consultation with matching experts |

| RISK | LIKELIHOOD | IMPACT OF RISK | EFFECTS | SECONDARY EFFECTS | RESPONSIBILITY | CONTINGENCY/ ACTION | STATUS |
|---|-------------------|-----------------------|--|--------------------------|---|--|--|
| Matching methodology inadequately trialled | Medium | Large | Can not adequately match Census and CCS data | | Jennet Baxter | Plan full trial of matching procedures in DR | See paper ONS(ONC(SC))98/14 |
| Names – Confidentiality issues if captured | Medium | Medium | Risk to Census | | Graham Jones | Capture in DR first. | Census Legislation – no legal reason why names may not be captured |
| Software not developed for matching and modelling | Low | Large | Cannot proceed with making estimates | | Marie Cruddas Simon King | Software being developed via prototyping | Ongoing liaison with Census IS. |
| 3. ESTIMATION – DESIGN GROUP AND LAD | | | | | | | |
| 3.1 Methodology Not possible to make estimates to the level required (LAD). | Low | Large | Minimum aim of ONC not possible | | Ian Diamond James Brown Owen Abbott | Standard estimation techniques to be adopted. Research underway to minimise any risk | |
| 3.2 Timing Resources not available: expertise, software etc. to develop methodology | Medium | Large | Production of estimates delayed, ONC not possible. | Risk to ONS reputation | Graham Jones | Ensure adequate resources available. Automate as much as possible. | Issue to be considered and included in the developmental timetable. |
| Estimates not available on time | Medium | Medium | Delay reduces value but does not remove it | | Marie Cruddas and ONC Project Team | Timetable issues always central when estimating resources | |
| 4. QUALITY ASSURANCE | | | | | | | |
| 4.1 Quality <u>National Level:</u> The quality of demographic sources is inadequate. | Low | Small | Demographic estimates will be possible | | Roma Chappell | P&VS will provide assessment of quality with the estimates | Research to produce uncertainty estimates on the national demographic estimates is included in paper ONS(ONC(SC))99/05 |

| RISK | LIKELIHOOD | IMPACT OF RISK | EFFECTS | SECONDARY EFFECTS | RESPONSIBILITY | CONTINGENCY/ ACTION | STATUS |
|---|-------------------|-----------------------|--|--------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Quality of administrative data not sufficient. | Medium | Small | | | Heather Wagstaff | | |
| <u>Sub national Level :</u> The quality of demographic sources is inadequate. | Low | Small | Likely that some demographic estimates will be possible | | Roma Chappell | Some assessment of quality will be possible | |
| Quality of administrative data not sufficient. (Note: These data will be used qualitatively rather than quantitatively.) | Medium | Small | | | Heather Wagstaff | | |
| 5. ADJUSTING THE DATABASE | | | | | | | |
| 5.1 Methodology Methodology for imputation of households and individuals not developed. | Medium | Medium | Full ONC not possible | | Ian Diamond Ray Chambers Marie Cruddas Heather Wagstaff | Methods currently being investigated. Communicate to customers the value of ONC LAD estimates for resource allocation purposes if full ONC not possible | See paper ONS(ONC(SC))99/08 |
| A practical methodology for weighting not developed. | Medium | Small | Tabulations not acceptable to users. Full ONC not possible | | Ian Diamond Ray Chambers Marie Cruddas Heather Wagstaff | Methods currently being investigated. Standard methods are available but may not be acceptable. | See paper ONS(ONC(SC))99/08 |

B2. Implementation Risks

| RISK | LIKELIHOOD | IMPACT OF RISK | EFFECTS | SECONDARY EFFECTS | RESPONSIBILITY | CONTINGENCY/ ACTION | STATUS |
|--|------------|----------------|--|---|---|---|------------------------------|
| 1. GENERAL MANAGEMENT | | | | | | | |
| 1.1 Confidence Damage to ONS reputation if not successful. | Medium | Medium | Undermines user confidence, primarily in Census | Undermines user confidence in other ONS business areas, particularly P&VS | Tim Jones Graham Jones Andy Teague | Contingency strategy | See paper ONS(ONC(SC))99/03A |
| 1.2 Methodology ONC methodology fails due to inadequate evaluation/methodology | Low | Large | Effects depend on level of failure and point in process at which failure occurs. | Undermines user confidence. Damage to ONS reputation | Tim Jones Graham Jones Andy Teague | Develop methodology. Evaluate Rehearsal | See paper ONS(ONC(SC))99/04 |
| 1.3 Timetable Timetable slippage | Medium | Medium | Impact on Census Outputs and hence user confidence | Impact on population estimates | Marie Cruddas to liase with Census Processing | Release of agreed LAD estimates prior to database adjustment | |
| 2 CCS and the ONC | | | | | | | |
| 2.1 Quality Failure to find sufficient of the people missed in the Census. | High | Large | Failure of CCS to meet need | Deal with in contingency strategy. | John Dixie | Design CCS to minimise this risk - ONC research designed to reduce likelihood | |
| Affect on outputs if CCS fails | Medium | Large | Reliance on demographic checks and other sources for distribution to users | | Andy Teague Ian Diamond | Contingency strategy | |

| RISK | LIKELIHOOD | IMPACT OF RISK | EFFECTS | SECONDARY EFFECTS | RESPONSIBILITY | CONTINGENCY/ ACTION | STATUS |
|---|-------------------|-----------------------|--|---------------------------------|---|---|------------------------------|
| Mis-reporting of information by interviewers (e.g. postcode, date of birth, etc.) | Low | Medium | Difficulty in matching to Census data - too few matches found. | Inaccurate population estimates | During fieldwork - John Dixie During matching Jennet Baxter | Research designed to minimise this risk. | |
| 3. PROCESSING THE CCS | | | | | | | |
| 3.1 Interface and Timing | | | | | | | |
| <u>Capture:</u> Not Integrated with Census processing | Low | Medium | Timetable effects and additional costs | | Marie Cruddas Simon King | | |
| <u>Matching</u> Matching methodology and software inadequate at implementation | Low | Large | Failure to match Census and CCS data adequately | | Jennet Baxter | Research to minimise this risk | |
| People and software not available to carry out the matching | Low | Large | Planned method not operable | | Marie Cruddas Jennet Baxter liasing with Census IS | Ensure adequate resources available | |
| 3.2 Quality | | | | | | | |
| Quality of matching not adequate | Low | Large | DSE/regression may not be possible | | Jennet Baxter Ian Diamond Marie Cruddas | Research to minimise this risk - Contingency plan. | See paper ONS(ONC(SC))99/03A |
| 4. ESTIMATION – DESIGN GROUP AND LAD | | | | | | | |
| 4.1 Quality | | | | | | | |
| Not possible to make estimates to the level required (LA and below). | Low | Large | Minimum aim of ONC not possible | | Ian Diamond | Robust standard methods adopted as far as possible. Prototype and test fully. | |

| RISK | LIKELIHOOD | IMPACT OF RISK | EFFECTS | SECONDARY EFFECTS | RESPONSIBILITY | CONTINGENCY/ ACTION | STATUS |
|---|-------------------|-----------------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| Resources not available: expertise, software etc for calculating estimates | Medium | Large | Planned method not operable | | Graham Jones | Ensure adequate resources available | |
| LA estimates not acceptable to LAs | Low | Large | Customer confidence lost | | P&VS and Census Divisions | Consult and inform as much as possible | Need to develop a strategy for agreement and release |
| 4.2 Timing Estimates not available on time | Medium | Medium | Delay reduces value but does not remove it | Impact on distribution of RSG | Marie Cruddas and ONC Project Team | Agree with DETR, DoH etc. what data they require and by when | |
| 5. QUALITY ASSURANCE | | | | | | | |
| 5.1 Timing <u>National Level:</u> The demographic estimates are not available on time. | Low | Medium | Delay in finalising figures | Delay in providing 2001 population estimates to DETR for RSG purposes | Roma Chappell | P&VS plan to ensure adequate resources are available to produce estimates. | |
| <u>Sub national Level :</u> The demographic estimates are not available on time. | Medium | Small | Possible delay in output | | Roma Chappell | | |
| 5.2 Quality National Demographic estimates do not (approximately) equal Census +CCS results | Medium | Large | None if Census+CCS taken as the Gold Standard. | Otherwise Contingency invoked | Roma Chappell Ian Diamond Andy Teague Marie Cruddas | QA strategy | See paper ONS(ONC(SC)99/09 |
| Estimates differ from admin records | Medium | Small | None: Admin records used as quality checks at aggregate level for specific popn groups | | Marie Cruddas | | |

| RISK | LIKELIHOOD | IMPACT OF RISK | EFFECTS | SECONDARY EFFECTS | RESPONSIBILITY | CONTINGENCY/ ACTION | STATUS |
|--|-------------------|-----------------------|---|--------------------------|---|---|-------------------------------|
| Sub national Demographic estimates do not (approximately) equal Census +CCS results. | Medium | Small | Explanation /resolution required. | | Roma Chappell Ian Diamond Marie Cruddas | QA strategy | See paper ONS(ONC(SC)99/09 |
| 6. ADJUSTING THE CENSUS DATA BASE | | | | | | | |
| 6.1 Quality Numbers do not add up to the 'One Number' | Low | Medium | ONC not achieved | | ONC Project Team | | |
| Output does not distinguish collected from imputed data | Medium | Large | Some users will wish to know how much data is "invented". | | Ian Diamond Ray Chambers Marie Cruddas | Provide indication of the amount of imputed data. | |

C2. Census Coverage Survey Risk Register

| RISK | LIKELIHOOD | IMPACT OF RISK | EFFECTS | SECONDARY EFFECTS | RESPONSIBILITY | CONTINGENCY/ ACTION |
|--|--------------------|---------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| 1. GENERAL MANAGEMENT | | | | | | |
| Importance of CCS not communicated to: Census Division ONS Public | Low Low High | Medium Small Medium | Difficulties in Survey conduct Reduced budget for CCS Reduced co-operation | Poor results Smaller sample Reduced response rate | CCS Project Board Director, Census CCS Team | Communicate Prepare case well Field staff of adequate quality and well-trained |
| Failure to integrate with IS strategy | Low | Large | Inability to deliver database | Cost and Time | CCS Team | Should be able to control |
| Failure of field procedures during CCSR | Medium | Small | Less reliable conclusions about procedures for the CCS | Greater risk to the CCS | CCS Team | Evaluate and re assess |
| Products on which the CCS depends delivered late | Low | Small | Delay in the survey | Delay in CCS database for the ONC Project | | CCS Working Group, plan in floats on all critical activities |
| Damage to ONS' reputation if CCS is not successful | Medium | Medium | Undermines user confidence, primarily in Census | Undermines user confidence in other ONS areas, particularly P&VS | CCS Project Board | |
| 2. CONDUCTING THE CCS | | | | | | |
| Failure to recruit appropriate ONS Census staff | Low | Small | Inability to conduct Survey effectively | Poor result | Recruitment panel | Adjust staff postings to minimise overall damage |
| Failure to retain appropriate ONS Census staff | Medium | Small | Inability to conduct Survey effectively | Poor result | Census senior management | Ensure staff are adequately rewarded |
| The CCS does not recruit enough Team Managers of adequate quality | Medium | Medium | Reduce the size of the CCS | Reduced information for ONC Project | Data Collection Support Project/Negotiator with OPS | Ensure workloads and pay are in line with market conditions. Target advertising |

| RISK | LIKELIHOOD | IMPACT OF RISK | EFFECTS | SECONDARY EFFECTS | RESPONSIBILITY | CONTINGENCY/ ACTION |
|--|-------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|---|
| The CCS does not recruit enough Interviewers of adequate quality | Medium | Medium | Reduce the size of the CCS | Reduced information for ONC Project | Data Collection Support Project/Negotiator with OPS | Ensure workloads and pay are in line with market conditions, Target advertising. |
| Inadequate training for field staff | High | Large | Poorly conducted CCS | Reduced response | CCS Project Board | Plan training to use the highest quality trainers possible and deliver it as directly as possible to the Interviewers |
| Incorrect timing of the CCS too soon after Census too late after Census | Low Low | Large Large | Interferes with the Census Quality of survey results reduced because of mobility amongst target population and forgetfulness | Public confusion over CCS or Census Failure to find some missing people | John Dixie | Research CCS optimum timing and plan field work to avoid these problems |
| Postcode maps not suitable for purpose | Low | Medium | Loss of accuracy in CCS | Poorer match with Census database | John Dixie | Spend more money on better maps |
| Failure to find sufficient number of the people missed by the census | High | Small | Failure of CCS to meet ONC requirements | ONC not carried down to the lowest planned level | CCS Project Board | Design CCS to minimise risk – plan reduced ONC as a contingency |
| Inaccurate/missing data collected by Interviewers from the public (e.g. postcode, date of birth, etc.) | Low | Medium | Difficulty in matching to Census data – too few matches found | ONC not carried down to the lowest planned level | John Dixie | Plan and deliver training to field staff to minimise this risk |
| 3. METHODOLOGY | | | | | | |
| Procedures used in Test CCS may not work well on a larger scale of the CCSR and CCS 2001 | Medium | Large | Poor results | | | Carry out contingency testing after the CCSR |
| CCSR and CCS Field Staff may not be of the same quality/standard as in the Brent Pilot | High | Medium | Poorer performance | Reduced response rate | | Revise recruitment criteria, improve training |

| RISK | LIKELIHOOD | IMPACT OF RISK | EFFECTS | SECONDARY EFFECTS | RESPONSIBILITY | CONTINGENCY/ ACTION |
|--|-------------------|-----------------------|---|---|-----------------------|--|
| Enumerators resign before they move to the CCS | Low | Small | Reduce the size of the CCS | Poorer results | | Plan to have reserve staff, including fresh staff who have not been enumerators |
| Public finds CCS burdensome | Low | Medium | Lack of Public co operation | Reduced data available for ONC Public dissatisfied | Publicity Project | Plan the interviews to be as short and simple as possible; Publicise reasons for Survey; Prepare Field Staff to answer likely questions; and; Offer a free information phone line. |
| 4. POLITICAL FACTORS | | | | | | |
| Political opinion against the Census or the CCS | Low | Medium | Low response rate | Reduced data available for ONC Public dissatisfied | Director, Census | Ensure Ministers and MPs are well briefed and have accepted the briefing information |
| General Election in 2001 causes Census and CCS to be put back by 2 weeks | Medium | Medium | Extra cost of retaining field staff and finding additional staff Poorer result as closer to end of university term and closer to the main holiday period | Extra stain on the CCS and Census teams in re-scheduling the work Change control for the main census contracts | Director, Census | None - have to re-plan to cope with the new schedule |

3. Development Timetables for the One Number Census and Census Coverage Survey

The timetables for developing the ONC methodology and CCS fieldwork are currently being redrafted in conjunction with the 1999 Rehearsal processing timetable and the plans for evaluating the 1999 Rehearsal ONC (see paper ONS(ONC(SC))99/04). The ONC Project Board will be responsible for monitoring the ONC timetable to ensure that key milestones are achieved and that resources are in place to carry out the necessary research, evaluation and implementation. The CCS Project Board will have an identical role for the CCS timetable.

4. One Number Census Processing Timetable

The timetable for processing the ONC in 2001 is being integrated with the 2001 Census timetable. This currently being established by the Census Programme Manager who is co-ordinating this activity across census processes and identifying input and output requirements. The process by which this will be agreed is within the remit of the Census Programme Board. Currently the assumptions about how long processes within the ONC take do not differ from those previously presented to the Steering Committee. Evaluation of the Census and CCS Rehearsals will allow more informed estimates of the time and resources required for the different processes within the ONC.

5. Contingency Strategy

At the last meeting of the Steering Committee an agenda for brainstorming the issues was presented. This meeting was held on 11th December and the topic has subsequently been the subject of a great deal of discussion. Currently it is planned to separate out the issues into quality assurance and contingency.

1) Quality Assurance

The paper 'Risk in Official Statistics: A Case Study of the 2001 One Number Census Project' (ONS(ONC(SC))99/09) outlines the Quality Assurance strategy.

2) Contingency

Paper ONS(ONC(SC))99/03A will be tabled at the meeting.