

MINUTES OF THE POPULATION AND MIGRATION STATISTICS COMMITTEE (SCOTLAND): 23 November 2005

Present:

Peter Scrimgeour	GROS, Chair
Jenny Boag	Falkirk Council
Richard Belding	Aberdeenshire Council
Jan Freeke	Glasgow City Council
Alistair Harvey	City of Edinburgh Council
Scherie Nicol	Highlands and Islands Enterprise
Julie Gilbert	ISD
James Croane	EDINA
June Bowman	ONS
Isla Macdonald	Eilean Siar Council
Chris Carr	Argyll & Bute Council
Iain MacAllister	Scottish Executive
Robert Williams	Scottish Executive
Ian Máté	GROS
Cecilia Macintyre	GROS
Esther Roughsedge	GROS
Paula Lopez	GROS
Ganka Mueller	GROS
Bryan Cunningham	GROS
Alan Fleming	GROS
Esta Clark	GROS, Secretary

1. Introductions and membership

(a) Apologies

1.1 Apologies were received from: Catriona Hayes (Scottish Executive), Julie Wilson (Scottish Executive) *represented by* Robert Williams, Ross Brown (Scottish Enterprise), Jennifer Bishop (ISD) *represented by* Julie Gilbert, Katrina Carmichael (Scottish Executive) *represented by* Iain MacAllister, Tim Riley (EDINA) *represented by* James Croane, Joy Dobbs (ONS) *represented by* June Bowman, Gordon McAdam (Communities Scotland), Anne Douglas (Shelter), Valerie West (GROS) and Paul Boyle (St Andrews University).

1.2 Peter Scrimgeour welcomed everyone to the meeting, noted the apologies received and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

2. Minutes of the PAMS meeting held on 2 June 2005 – PAMS (05) 10

2.1 Jenny Boag pointed out that section 4.8 should say that DWP were speaking at the BURISA conference, not holding the conference.

2.2 The previous meeting's minutes were then approved.

3. Update on action points from the last meeting - PAMS (05) 11

3.1 Action point 3.1: Graham Jackson to pursue work with ONS to agree recommendations for appropriate use of SMR's. Ongoing: discussions were held with ISD in early 2005 and it was decided that this was a wider issue. It is planned to produce a paper on some aspects of age standardised rates. Graham Jackson to inform PAMS when progress has been made on this.

Action Graham Jackson

3.2 Action point 3.2: Alan Fleming explained that due to staffing issues not much progress had been made on putting 2001 geographies onto the 1991 database but he hoped that work would start on this in the not too distant future. As yet there was no timescale for this work. Alan agreed to let PAMS know once a timetable has been drawn up.

Action Alan Fleming

3.3 Other action points from the previous meeting had been completed or would be by the next meeting.

4. Progress on the work of the Scottish Population Survey Coordinating Committee (item moved up the agenda)

4.1 Robert Williams gave an update on this item. He explained that the Continuous Population Survey (CPS) had now changed its name to "Integrated Household Survey (IHS)" as it was felt that this defines more clearly what it is. Robert also informed the group that the Office for National Statistics (ONS) had released today (23 Nov) the results of its consultation process which ended late 2004 which looked at what the then, CPS should look like, topics, etc. Robert agreed to send a link to the report to Esta Clark so that she could circulate it to the group:

<http://www.statistics.gov.uk/StatBase/Product.asp?vlnk=9668&Pos=&ColRank=1&Rank=272>.

Action Robert Williams

4.2 Robert explained that the Annual Population Survey (APS) in England and Wales will not continue in to 2006. In Scotland, the APS is known as the Labour Force Survey boost and this will be continued.

4.3 Robert reported that the Scottish Executive and others were continuing discussions with ONS on what the socio-economic questions should be for the core for the IHS. Robert explained that work would be carried out into design and content and that if the decision was taken to go ahead then the IHS would go into the field in 2007. *[Post meeting note: The IHS should go live in 2008.]*

4.4 Cecilia Macintyre asked whether Robert would be corresponding with PAMS and others about the content etc of the IHS. Robert replied that someone in the SE would be. He explained that we would need to think about what we need in Scotland and how different this was to what was needed in England and Wales. Robert went on to explain that an agreement in principle had been reached with the Scottish Household Survey, the Scottish House Condition Survey, the Scottish Crime Survey and the Scottish Health Survey that they would look to realign and harmonise over the medium to long-term. He noted that some surveys may, however, require a different design but there would be a common design where this was practical.

4.5 Robert also mentioned that the Scottish Household Survey was considering moving towards a modular un-clustered design and that if this happened then not all topics would be available at all geographies. Cecilia Macintyre asked who was doing the review. Robert replied that the review was being carried out by Ewan McCaig. Robert also mentioned that a procurement strategy was being developed for Scottish surveys as several would be going into procurement in 2006. It was also hoped to have pages dedicated to surveys in Scotland on the SE's website in the near future. Finally, Robert mentioned that a pilot study would be set up to look into whether the new Definitive National Address (DNA) database could be used for drawing a sampling frame for Scottish Surveys and also help for the Census.

4.6 Jan Freeke asked whether the IHS would cover Scotland. Robert replied that it would. Esther Roughsedge asked whether the Scottish Surveys were going to be integrated. Robert did not want to discount this over the long-term and compared some Scottish surveys to oil tankers - taking 2-3 years to turn them. Cecilia Macintyre pointed out that the difference for ONS was that they "carry out" all their surveys whereas in Scotland the SE contracts the large scale surveys out.

4.7 Peter Scrimgeour noted that there was a lot of interest in this subject from PAMS and that this item should be on the agenda for future meetings.

5. SCOTSTAT**(a) Board meeting update (8th meeting 23 August 2005) - PAMS (05) 12**

5.1 Jenny Boag (the PAMS representative on the SCOTSTAT board) presented her report from the last SCOTSTAT board meeting, noting that the papers were not yet on the website and that she had emailed Rob Wishart to this effect. She said that there was nothing specific for the PAMS group and that there had been a presentation from Robert Williams and also an update on disclosure control. Jenny asked the group if they had any questions.

5.2 Peter Scrimgeour thanked Jenny and mentioned that he had also been at the meeting (as the GROS representative as distinct from the PAMS representative). He reported that there had been some discussion as to whether SCOTSTAT was as effective as it could be. Jenny added that there was a question as to whether all committees functioned as well as PAMS does and noted that local authorities were heavily represented on the committees.

(b) PAMS Work plan - PAMS (05) 13

5.3 Peter Scrimgeour introduced this item noting that the work plan was mostly factual and now out of date but that the SCOTSTAT board had looked at these reports from all the committees. Jenny Boag noted that it would be useful if next time more could be included on Census and population developments in the PAMS work plan. Peter said that an updated version would be produced if requested from the board.

6. Census

(a) 2001 Census: Progress Report - PAMS (05) 14

6.1 Alan Fleming introduced this paper and advised that the main Census products which had been released since the last meeting were:-

- Standard and Theme tables for the new Westminster Parliamentary Constituencies have been placed on the GROS website;
- The SCROL DVD, which combines the information in the 7 already released CDs, is now available;
- The 2nd version of the bulk supply, which includes travel and migration information, was recently released;
- The Gaelic Report was published and a press conference was held in Stornoway;
- A household SAR, containing Scottish data, can now be accessed in a microdata laboratory setting in London, Titchfield, Southport and Newport;
- Customer services had been dealing with an average of around 200 requests a month recently.

6.2 Alan explained that, in the months ahead, work was planned for the following:-

- Produce supplementary products to the bulk supply e.g. producing “numbers” versions of “Key Statistics” tables for which only “percentage” versions have been produced to date;
- Add the new Westminster Parliamentary Constituencies tables to the SCROL website;
- The Small Area Microdata (SAM) SAR will be made publicly available for the UK;
- A public version of the Household SAR will be released soon, although this will only cover England and Wales data;
- While SARS are currently available in laboratory settings in London and Titchfield, Southport and Newport, GROS are looking into the possibility of providing a laboratory facility in Ladywell House;
- Frank Thomas produced a lot of information on Census Quality before he retired and it was hoped to publish this on the GROS website soon;
- Work had started on producing an occasional paper on travel, using information from the 2001 Census;
- To continue to review the GROS and SCROL websites.

Alan mentioned that there was currently a backlog in updating the list on the website of completed requests for commissioned tables.

6.3 Peter Scrimgeour thanked Alan for his update and asked if there were any questions. Richard Belding asked whether the DVDs were duplicates of previous material. Alan clarified that they included corrections for known errors. Alistair Harvey asked whether if he had a full set of CDs were they correct? Alan replied that they were but that there was also more on the DVD. Robert Williams asked whether the DVDs were being automatically sent out or whether they were only sent out on request. Alan said that he would need to check with colleagues and provide an update to members. ***[Post meeting note: DVDs were only sent to those who had specifically requested a copy.]***

Action Alan Fleming

6.4 Jan Freeke asked about progress on the Scottish Longitudinal Study. Peter Scrimgeour replied that this work was coming along and that he hoped by the next PAMS meeting to have a paper on how it can be used and the types of research that could be under taken.

Action Ganka Mueller

(b) & (c) 2011 Census Progress – PAMS (05) 15 - PAMS (05) 17 and Place of birth – brief of UNECE and Irish Position (These two items were discussed together)

- 6.5 Ian Máté introduced these items and talked through the paper and forms. The main points were:
- There was not enough resource to quality assure the 2006 Census Test form as well as produce the 3 monthly update so this would lapse until the resource was again free. In the meantime though he would still like to hear from everyone if they have any comments or queries;
 - Ian said that he thought the 2006 Census Test document was a well rounded one which reflected concerns in Scotland and tried to meet these needs e.g. the income question,crofting question and better housing question;
 - For the individual question they had tried to integrate married and civil partnership;
 - For the health question "...12 months or more" it had been difficult to get a question which pleased everyone;
 - The wording of the "birth question" had been changed as testing had found that it was upsetting to some people as it referred to recording "live births only", it now refers to excluding still births which has had a better reception in focus groups. Robert Williams asked whether the question was asked of women of all ages. Ian replied that it was;
 - Ian explained that that there were two questions from a competition for school children and one had made it into the test. Feedback from Age Concern and focus groups is that they like the question on feeling safe going out at night but despite this it probably won't survive to 2011;
 - There was some discussion around the ethnicity question e.g. Jenny Boag asked where white Americans, Australians and Canadians would classify themselves etc.

6.6 Ian Máté moved on to talk about second homes and visitors and referred to examples of these questions which ONS had prepared. Ian noted that both GROS and ONS planned to test the second homes questions although he felt that the space taken up by these questions was enormous and they also raised issues about population definitions. He also noted that these questions also tried to identify the "hidden homeless" and that Shelter were interested in this. Another issue is how children of divorced parents would be counted i.e. would they be picked up twice.

6.7 Peter Scrimgeour thanked Ian and asked the group whether they had any questions. Jenny Boag said that Ian's paper was the one which generated the most interest at the morning's local authority meeting. She agreed that the second homes questions took up too much space given that there needed to be space for the migration questions and others. She said that the councils with the most interest would go away, look at this paper further and then feed comments back.

Action Local authority side PAMS members

6.8 More generally, Jenny continued, she recognised that there was nothing to be done about changing the form and was happy for it to be tested and she looked forward to seeing the results. Jenny also said that she thought it would be more useful if local authorities could sit down and go through the form with GROS after the Test had been evaluated rather than be involved in a paper/email consultation process. Both Ian and Peter thought this was a good idea.

- 6.9 There was further discussion about Census questions. The main points were:
- An individual income question versus a household income question. Scherie Nicol said that she would prefer an individual question or nothing. Jenny Boag said that view was debatable and that any income question is better than none. Ian Máté pointed out the problem of confidentiality for the individual income question as there are not separate forms for each person in the Test. Peter Scrimgeour added that GROS were testing the household question and ONS and NISRA were testing the individual question. Jenny Boag said it was a good approach to test both questions;
 - Jan Freeke asked about disclosure control plans. Ian said that these still had to be decided. Jenny and others said that they were very happy with what was done for Scottish data for the 2001 Census and that they would be very concerned if this was not done again and the method used in England and Wales (the Small Cell Adjustment Method) was applied. Jenny continued to say that colleagues from local authorities in England and Wales were jealous of the data she could get in Scotland, and that in some cases the data they got for England and Wales was useless.

6.10 Peter Scrimgeour thanked everyone for the detailed discussion and pointed out that the 2006 Census Test would not cover some questions that we know work, some questions won't make it to 2011 and other questions not there may yet make it. Peter reiterated that Jenny's workshop idea should be taken forward after the 2006 Census test – March 2007 or something like that. Ian Máté concluded by saying that an output timetable should be available sometime soon.

Item 5 (g) was moved up the agenda

(g) Census alternatives update – PAMS (05) 18

6.11 Ganka Mueller introduced this item and briefly talked through the main points of the paper. Ganka reported that she had acquired new data from DWP on young children and older people. Initial work on comparing the School Census against mid-year estimates had been completed and had been passed to the demography branch for input for the small area population estimates. Ganka's branch had also carried out work into comparing DVLA information to Census information and concluded that it was very different to Census data and that they did not recommend replacing Census data with DVLA data. Ganka also drew the group's attention to the data linkage work outlined in her paper.

6.12 Peter Scrimgeour thanked Ganka for her update, noted that the branch had changed its name to "Alternative sources" and asked for any questions. Jenny Boag said that it was good to see progress being made. Jenny wondered about access to the electoral register and mentioned that there had been a policy change which meant that if no contact was made for 2 years then that person was taken off the register. She suspected that this meant that there was a higher level of under-registration. June Bowman added that the same had been seen in England – a dip in the last few years. Ganka queried whether it changed around election times. June replied that it doesn't.

6.13 Jan Freeke asked how the linking of Census records to CHI records was going. Ganka replied that the analysis had showed the strengths and weaknesses of using CHI data and that the analysis had been passed on to the demography branch to feed into the small area population estimate work. Jan mentioned that the SAPE working group should look at this. Peter Scrimgeour concluded the discussion by noting that Ganka's branch already passed any findings on to Celia's branch who would feed them into the SAPE working group discussions as appropriate.

(e) ONS's Census 2011 consultation plans – PAMS (05) 17

6.14 June Bowman from ONS introduced this item and explained that the paper PAMS (05) 17 was a collection of papers which had been presented to ONS's Census Advisory Group. June reported that they had received an overwhelming response to their consultation which finished on 5 August. The next step was to pull together the responses and publish them probably in the spring of 2006.

6.15 June mentioned that work had started on what the 2011 Census outputs should look like. She said that ONS would aim for consistency and accessibility and that hopefully outputs would be free at the point of delivery though this depended on funding. There was some discussion about statistical disclosure control and June said that ONS would aim for a common UK methodology. Jenny Boag repeated her point that she would be extremely upset if Scotland ended up with the disclosure control regime that England and Wales had for the 2001 Census output. Peter Scrimgeour replied that the policy on disclosure control was due to be agreed fairly early on in the Census cycle and views would be welcome. Jan Freeke asked whether the 2001 output areas would be maintained for 2011. Peter replied that this had not been decided and that the material in the paper was ONS's views but that Scotland would be thinking about this in parallel with them and that in due course these issues will be consulted on.

(f) Update on UKCDMAC meeting on the 13th of October 2005

6.16 Jenny Boag introduced this item explaining that the group was called "UK Census Design and Methodology Advisory Committee (UKCDMAC)". Jenny explained that the group was very technical in nature and concentrated on technical matters rather than what questions should be included etc. Jenny said that the group included herself, four academics, ONS representatives as well as a representative (Ian Máté on this occasion) from GROS. Jenny thought that the last meeting had been more effective than previous meetings and mentioned that the group had looked at a paper on "What constituted a successful Census". The group was also looking for people to QA work at a technical level. Peter Scrimgeour asked whether there was one big group or whether there were working groups? Jenny said there would be small working groups of people with expertise in a topic/area. Peter queried whether the Census should be continued as an item on the PAMS agenda or whether there should be a separate working group. Jenny reminded the

group that PAMS was the old Census Advisory Group and thought that the same people would be interested in population/household stats as well as the Census. Jenny thought it was sensible to keep it in one group. Peter Scrimgeour concluded that he was happy about how it worked just now but that PAMS should keep this structure under review (in case the sheer importance of the Census as a topic meant that it came to dominate the meeting unduly, or meetings to discuss Census issues were required more frequently than the usual PAMS meeting cycle).

7 Non-Census Issues

(a) Population estimates and projections update – PAMS (05) 19

7.1 Cecilia Macintyre introduced this item explaining that the paper was a summary of what the Demography branch had been doing recently. Cecilia started by explaining that a new UK Demography Centre had been set up in ONS and that the national projections work was moving from the Government Actuary's Department to this new centre in ONS after recommendations from the Morris review. It was not yet clear what this meant for GROS but she would keep PAMS posted.

7.2 Cecilia explained that Gillian Miller had left to go on maternity leave early and hence the SAPE working group meeting planned for the following week had been cancelled. Cecilia added that she was looking for feedback on the recently published SAPEs. There was a feedback form on the GROS website and the consultation period was fairly flexible. Cecilia explained that a temporary staff member had been employed to help with the SAPE work and they were working on a comparison of the SAPE with the Alternative Sources branch's data sources. Cecilia hoped that the SAPE working group meeting would be held at the end of January and that by then the results of some of this analysis would be available and would lead to a more valuable meeting. Cecilia continued to explain that related work had been started to look into producing postcode population estimates as there was a demand from the SE for areas which could not be made up from data zones. This work also feeds in to the work on producing settlement and locality population estimates. Cecilia also mentioned that a project was underway (led by Robert Williams) to produce historical data zone population estimates as there was a demand from (amongst others) the SE Health Department and ISD for them.

7.3 Cecilia highlighted that the national population projections had been published on 20 October and there had been a lot of coverage in the press and there had also been an internal seminar on the results for SE policy colleagues and analysts. Cecilia added that there had been a joint household and population projections seminar on projection methods which had been well received, going by the complementary feedback received. The presentations from this seminar would be available on the GROS website shortly and a link would be added in the minutes. [<http://www.gro-scotland.gov.uk/statistics/user-consultation-groups-seminars/seminars/pop-and-house-proj/index.html>]

Action Cecilia Macintyre

7.4 Cecilia added that a new publication dedicated to life expectancy had been published for the first time on 6 October which had been well received. This was to be an annual publication and she would welcome any comments.

(b) Dissemination of migration data update – PAMS (05) 20

7.5 Cecilia explained that since this paper had been written, David Knowles from ISD had responded to her letter and agreed that single year of age data at datazone could be released. Cecilia said that this data would not be put on the website but it was available on request. Jan Freeke asked whether the data he had previously asked for could now be sent to him. Cecilia said yes and that he was on the request list maintained by the branch.

Action Cecilia Macintyre

7.6 A discussion followed about both Cecilia's papers and the following main points were covered:

- Jenny Boag said that she had heard complimentary reports of the projection seminar and personally she had enjoyed it. She thought it had been very useful and she had learnt a lot – claps on backs – and she would like to see more of this type of event in the future, as these events used to be done in the past.

- Jenny continued to say that there were still substantial problems with datazone geographies and she said she was looking forward to Peter Scrimgeour's paper on the strategy for population estimates at the next meeting. Jenny noted that ward boundaries would change in 2007 posing more challenges and that ideally she would like a flexible geography which would allow her to design her own tables for a particular geography. Cecilia wondered whether this was something that the SCOTSTAT board should look at. Jenny replied that she had suggested this at the last PAMS meeting. Peter Scrimgeour said that he was not sure it was for the board - perhaps it could be picked up by the new neighbourhood statistics SCOTSTAT group. Peter said that he would keep this in mind when putting together the strategy paper.
- Peter Scrimgeour noted that there was a wider issue about how well the SCOTSTAT groups were working and that this would be looked at within the Scottish statistics group. Jenny Boag added that not all groups worked as well as PAMS.
- Jenny Boag said that she would revisit a paper she had written previously for the SCOTSTAT board regarding the issues with current geographies.
- Richard Belding said that he had never liked datazones but that by 2007 they will have a purpose as there would be 19 wards rather than the current 6 or 7 in Aberdeenshire and he thought that datazones would probably give a reasonable approximation to the new wards and therefore have a purpose.
- Jan Freeke asked whether historic datazone population estimates would be available for 1991 to 2001. Cecilia replied yes that is the plan. Jan also asked when would the population projections working group meet. Cecilia said that she hoped this work would go forward soon but that at the moment there was a resource constraint. She added that Ludi Simpson had been in touch about the possibility of making available a version of his software that councils could use in the short-term. Jan Freeke said that this was good but we shouldn't forget about the existing model.
- Cecilia Macintyre also mentioned that there had been problems with the fit of datazones to the Cairngorms National Park area.

(c) International migration – PAMS (05) 21

7.7 Cecilia Macintyre explained that the paper PAMS (05) 21 was a copy of the International Migration Statistics Quality Review Implementation Plan update, a final copy of which would be available on the ONS website shortly. Peter Scrimgeour noted that the migration review was an ongoing programme and that Cecilia would be happy to answer any questions.

(d) Household estimates and projections update – PAMS (05) 07

- 7.8 Esther Roughsedge introduced this paper and covered the following main points:
- New household estimates had been published recently and had received high profile coverage in the press. Esther said that she would welcome any comments on the publication.
 - Esther said that her branch was currently working on small area household estimates at datazone level using data from council tax systems. She hoped to have the data by next September and that a specification for the data collection had been drawn up. She said that if anyone wanted to see the specification then she was happy to pass it on.
 - Esther said that a point that was not in the paper was that a useful report had been written by a colleague (Ruth Harris) on the availability of tenure information from council tax systems. Esther said she was happy to pass a copy of this on if there was interest. The group indicated that there was.

Action Esther Roughsedge

- Esther mentioned that the next household projections would be published in April 2006 [**Post-meeting note – now rescheduled to May**]. She noted that the population and household projections seminar had been very useful and that she would be looking to review the household projections methodology looking at, for example, the period covered by the projections, geographic areas, changes in planning areas etc. She also hoped to look at alternative sources for headship rates from survey information rather than relying solely on Census information which can become out of date. This review work would be for the 2006-based projections rather than the 2004-based household projections.
- Esther also noted that a new small area data collection on the term-time residence of students was planned.

7.9 Jan Freeke asked whether Ruth Harris's work could be sent to a colleague in Renfrewshire Council. Esther said that she would ask Ruth to contact Jan so that he could pass on any information as necessary.

Action Esther Roughsedge

7.10 Peter Scrimgeour thanked Esther for her paper noting that there had been good, positive progress on the household statistics work.

(e) IMPS Project – PAMS (05) 23

7.11 June Bowman from ONS introduced this paper and explained that IMPS stood for "Improving Migration and Population Statistics". The aim of the project was to improve migration and population statistics and also avoid some of the problems in this area that ONS had had with their last Census. The project draws a number of streams together and includes the implementation of the National Statistics Quality Review of International Migration. She noted that the project worked with other departments and that Cecilia Macintyre was involved especially with the International Migration work. June explained that additional resources had been found to progress this work, and the project was looking at things like how housing demand relates to an increase in population etc.

7.12 June also mentioned the vision for an "Integrated Population Statistics System (IPSS)" saying that a consultation document had been produced focusing on "how do we use the data that we already have". The paper also looked at benefits and risks.

7.13 Peter Scrimgeour thanked June and said that it would be interesting to see how this work progresses and that he was keen for PAMS to be kept informed of progress. Peter also noted that GROS were doing similar reviews but not on the scale ONS was.

8. Progress on research on demographic topics

8.1 Iain MacAllister from the SE updated the group on the progress that had been made on research on demographic topics. He explained that the six ESRC projects were progressing fairly well and that results from some of them should be available in the next few months. He clarified that there had been no real dissemination of any results as yet.

8.2 Peter Scrimgeour thanked Iain for his update and asked whether there would be a seminar or conference to launch the results of the research. Iain replied probably and that it was hoped to produce a summary paper on the results by next autumn.

9. Review of GROS websites

9.1 Alan Fleming introduced this item explaining that a new web coordinator had been employed by the Statistics Division in GROS to look at the statistical side of the website. Alan explained that there had been a favourable review by the "Plain English Campaign" of the GROS and SCROL website. As part of the review, some changes had been suggested and GROS were in the process of implementing them. Once these changes have been implemented, GROS intended to resubmit the website for review against the Crystal Mark standard.

9.2 A customer survey had been conducted from April to August covering both the GROS and the SCROL website and about 80 responses had been received.

9.3 Alan informed the group that progress had been made with the website with a new "Quick Reference" section and also new weekly and monthly birth and death data. Alan explained that it was hoped to give the 2001 Census pages more prominence and more structure and remove any out of date pages. Alan said that he would welcome any comments on the website.

10. Any Other Business

10.1 Jan Freeke said that Glasgow City Council would like to raise again their objection to their 2001 Census results. Jan had been instructed to pursue the case and would like a meeting with GROS to discuss further. Peter Scrimgeour said that GROS was happy to do that and asked Jan to formally write to him requesting a meeting.

11. Date of next meeting

11.1 There was some discussion around when the date for the next meeting should be. Cecilia Macintyre mentioned that it may be useful to arrange the PAMS meetings so that they could then feed into ONS planning/consultation meetings. It was agreed to consider this when picking a date for the next meeting. The secretary will consult members in due course.