

# MINUTES OF THE POPULATION AND MIGRATION STATISTICS COMMITTEE (SCOTLAND): 26 June 2007

## Present:

Kirsty MacLachlan	GROS (Chair)
Sheena Stevely	Renfrewshire Council
Jan Freeke	Glasgow City Council
Jenny Boag	Falkirk Council
Richard Belding	Aberdeenshire Council
Chris Carr	Argyll & Bute Council
Jim Newman	ONS
Alistair Harvey	City of Edinburgh Council
Sherie Nichol	Highlands and Islands Enterprise
Cheryl Heeley	ISD
Cecilia Macintyre	GROS
Ganka Mueller	GROS
Esther Roughsedge	GROS
Thomas Robertson	GROS
Neil Jackson	GROS
Paul Fensom	GROS
Alan Fleming	GROS
Nick Wright	GROS
Bryan Cunningham	GROS
Andrew White	GROS (Secretary)

## 1. Introductions and membership

- 1.1 Apologies were received from: Paul Boyle (St Andrew's University), Ross Brown (Scottish Enterprise), Claire Boag (Scottish Executive), Marina Hughes (Scottish Executive), Janette Purbrick (Scottish Executive), Luke Cavanagh (Scottish Executive), Louise Virdee (Scottish Executive), Peter Scrimgeour (GROS) and Valerie West (GROS) *represented* by Neil Jackson and Paul Fensom.
- 1.2 Kirsty MacLachlan welcomed everyone to the meeting, noted the apologies received and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

## 2. Minutes of the PAMS meeting held on 27 November 2006 – PAMS (06) 27

- 2.1 The previous meeting's minutes were approved by group members.

## 3. Update on action points from Previous Meeting - PAMS (06) 28

- 3.1 Action Point 6.2: Kirsty MacLachlan to feed the migration assumptions issue back to the NPP group at the next meeting. There was some confusion as to what was meant by this action point. Jan Freeke explained that the comment was in relation to possible interim national projections. Yearly migration assumptions would be useful to local authorities irrespective of whether interim projections were produced.

- 3.2 Action Point 6.12: Esther Roughsedge/Sharon Meighan to give an update on work comparing the Census test address lists with the DNA-S and Assessor Portal addresses at the next PAMS meeting. Esther said that she would like to gather further comments on the paper before releasing it to PAMS but would circulate the paper before the next PAMS meeting. Esther also mentioned that Sharon was leaving GROS.

**Action: Esther Roughsedge**

- 3.3 Action Point 7.6: Scottish Enterprise was undertaking some in-house research on A8 migration into Scotland and will be commissioning further research in 2007. Ross Brown would circulate a paper summarising the work to PAMS. Work has been delayed; PAMS members can contact Ross Brown for further details.

#### **4. SCOTSTAT (Oral update)**

- 4.1 Jenny Boag reported that the SCOTSTAT board recognised that some committees (including PAMS) were working well but that interest had to be raised elsewhere. Jenny will report back at next PAMS meeting assuming that a SCOTSTAT board meeting takes place before then.

**Action: Jenny Boag**

#### **5. Developments in small area household and dwelling data (Presentation)**

- 5.1 Thomas Robertson presented small area dwelling count information which was recently published on SNS and small area household estimates from the recent pilot data collection.
- 5.2 Esther responded to a query about data quality by saying that quality assurance work thus far suggested that the data seemed sensible.
- 5.3 Sherie Nichol asked whether the data had been tested for other areas, in particular rural areas. Esther said that the data seemed ok and that if anyone wanted to see data for their own areas they should get in touch. Jenny Boag mentioned that this had been discussed at the morning meeting and that there had been widespread interest. Jenny will send details of PAMS local authority representatives to Esther and Thomas who will in turn send data to each local authority on their own area, where pilot data are available.

**Action: Jenny Boag / Esther Roughsedge**

- 5.4 Sheena Stevely asked whether house size was likely to be gauged consistently by different assessors. Thomas Robertson replied that this was consistent locally but not necessarily nationally. GROS had compared each local authority's figures to the Census data, and worked with the Assessors to improve the consistency of the data across Scotland. Some data was lost when the poll tax was abolished and a similar problem exists now with the likely abolition of council tax.
- 5.5 Jenny Boag mentioned that after the poll tax was abolished assessors kept the address list up to date and that Peter Scrimgeour should be able to provide more information as he sat on the working group at the time.

- 5.6 Jan Freeke added that when Esther and Thomas approach councils for the first full data collection in September they should also contact PAMS Local Authority representatives.

**Action: Esther Roughsedge / Thomas Robertson**

- 5.7 There were no further questions on the presentation.

## **6. Non-Census Issues**

### **(a) Population and Migration Statistics Update – PAMS (07) 01**

- 6.1 Cecilia Macintyre introduced the paper and highlighted some of the key issues. In particular she informed the group that mid-year estimates for 2003-2006 were being revised due to a problem in the way international migrants were allocated between councils in Grampian and Tayside Health board areas. This will also impact on the SAPE and will mean revising the 2004 sub-national population projections.

- 6.2 Cecilia also mentioned the upcoming Statistics User Conference being organised by the ScotStat board. Each ScotStat group has been asked to provide up to 5 nominations of users who would benefit from attending the event and who are not currently affiliated to ScotStat. Richard Belding asked whether PAMS representatives would also be invited to attend. Andrew White informed the group that the organisers had asked that 1 or 2 non-SE members of PAMS attend. Jenny Boag commented that all PAMS local authority representatives would be interested in attending, not just for the population and migration part of the event but for the whole event. Sheena Stevely added that it would be good to have a number of events held around Scotland so that it was not necessary for everyone to travel to Edinburgh. Kirsty MacLachlan offered to look into this.

**Action: Kirsty MacLachlan**

**Post Meeting Note:** This was brought up with a member of the ScotStat Board Support Group who are organising the meeting. It was felt that this was a valid issue but not practical at this stage.

- 6.3 Richard Belding asked how much money was involved as a result of Local Government Finance having to potentially change their allocations due to the Mid-Year Estimate revisions. Cecilia Macintyre said that she did not know what the impact would be. LGF were currently seeking advice from the minister on the process to reimburse councils.
- 6.4 Sherie Nichol brought up the issue of settlements and localities, PAMS (07) 01 having invited comments from PAMS members as to the need for a regular publication. Sherie informed the group that Highland do their own work as they feel that the GROS definitions are out of date. Cecilia Macintyre explained that the GROS definitions are based on Census postcodes and that these are distributed to Local Authorities. Cecilia added that Local Government Finance and SNS wanted the data the last time it was published and so it was produced. Jenny Boag added that localities in particular were useful as people were more likely to ask for the population of, for example, Paisley than for 15 datazones. This issue will be discussed further at a later meeting or a SAPE meeting.

- 6.5 Jan Freeke asked whether the 2006 national population projections would include publication of scenarios. Cecilia Macintyre answered that some variants would be published at the same time but that these were unlikely to include scenarios as such. Cecilia offered to bring this up at the NPP meeting on 27 June 2007. Jan Freeke asked that an indication of what was discussed at the meeting regarding the impact of economic factors would be useful and Cecilia Macintyre said that this would be circulated with the minutes.

**Post Meeting Note:** These have recently been sent to PPWG members and will be sent to PAMS members shortly.

- 6.6 There were no further questions on this paper.

**(b) Review of International Migration – PAMS (07) 02**

- 6.7 Nick Wright outlined the new method for distributing international migrants proposed by ONS. It is estimated that this would have reduced migration to Scotland by about 6,000 migrants over the last 5 years.

- 6.8 Jan Freeke commented that if this represented a better method then it should be used but wondered to what extent new visitor and migrant switcher assumptions were researched and to what extent they were guesstimates. Jim Newman commented that a lot of information on this was available on the internet at: <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/about/data/methodology/specific/population/future/imps/updates/default.asp> and that the changes were still only planned and not yet implemented. He added that a 2003 National Statistics Quality Review had recommended that the labour force survey be used to distribute migrants around the UK. The Labour Force Survey (LFS) was shown to give a similar distribution to the Census whereas the International Passenger Survey (IPS) differs from both. Using a 3 year average of the LFS stabilises the large fluctuations of the IPS with the result that in some years certain parts of the country benefit whilst in others they lose out compared to the old method. Jan Freeke asked what the basis was for the changes made to visitor and migrant switchers and Jim answered that additional questions had been added to the IPS. ONS feel that this is a better method and Jim strongly recommended that Scotland give some representation to visitor switchers given the new accession states.

- 6.9 Cecilia Macintyre explained that the previous TIM methodology has not been used as her predecessor had issues with some aspects of the method. However GROS have committed to evaluating this new approach and this paper is the first stage. She pointed out that there is a possibility of calculating the number of visitor switchers by applying percentages to the number of visitors to Scotland rather than taking the total number of visitor switchers for the UK and then using the calibrated IPS to arrive at a Scotland figure. This will be followed up with colleagues in Scottish Executive, who use visitor data.

- 6.10 Jim Newman commented on the fact that almost all Asylum Seekers were allocated to Glasgow. Cecilia Macintyre confirmed this was the case, and noted that the TIM method of estimating asylum seekers is likely to be adopted.

- 6.11 Jan Freeke suggested it might be best to have a follow up meeting and it was felt that this might take place once GROS has considered how international migrants should be distributed to local authority level. Jenny Boag felt that, given the fairly technical nature of the issue, a limited number of people might be interested in

being involved. Kirsty suggested a small group could meet for a one off meeting and that ONS should be invited. Jim Newman requested that the meeting be after August and Cecilia Macintyre added that a decision would have to be reached by February 2008.

**Action: Cecilia Macintyre / Kirsty MacLachlan**

6.12 There were no further questions on this paper.

At this point the Chair called a short break and upon the resumption of the meeting it was decided that the Census issues would be discussed next to allow people to leave before the end of the meeting where necessary.

## **7 Census**

### **(a) 2001 Census Update – PAMS (07) 05**

7.1 Alan Fleming gave an update to the meeting, mentioning that it covered all of his branch's work, including the production of the Registrar General's Annual Report and work on website, as well as the 2001 census. He invited feedback on the new Life Expectancy factsheet which was handed out at the meeting and had been produced in collaboration with Cecilia Macintyre's branch. He also asked whether it was worth placing datazone level data on SCROL and for ideas for time-series data to go on the website.

7.2 Jenny Boag said that she liked the factsheet and that it was similar in style to those produced by some councils. She added that some councils use datazone level data, calculating it themselves but that it would be ideal on SCROL. Sherie Nichol pointed out that in the long run datazones would be needed on the website to allow comparison with the 2011 census.

7.3 Richard Belding mentioned that councils are often unable to access data on SCROL as it was only available as ZIP files. Alan said he would look into whether unzipped files could be placed on SCROL.

**Action: Alan Fleming**

7.4 Thomas Robertson asked who the factsheet was aimed at, suggesting that if it was for the general public it may be necessary to explain, on the factsheet, what a 95% confidence interval is. Alan said he would look into this.

**Action: Alan Fleming**

7.5 Jenny Boag mentioned the differences in creating multi-member wards from census output areas (as on SCROL) and from datazones (SNS). She felt it was more of an issue for SNS. Cecilia Macintyre mentioned that a student was looking at the differences between producing various geographies from output areas, postcodes or datazones and that she would arrange a presentation on the work at the next PAMS meeting.

**Action: Cecilia Macintyre**

7.6 Chris Carr noted that it was now much easier to talk people through where to find things on the GROS website. Overall, the PAMS members found the new GROS statistics website section easy to use, though they found it frustrating that the old links no longer worked.

- 7.7 Alan Fleming also mentioned that NOMIS were proposing to put UK origin-destination travel/workplace data on their website. He asked for opinions on whether the data for Scotland should cover all persons or, as with England and Wales data, should just cover people aged 16-74 in employment. NOMIS would prefer that only the data that is equivalent to England & Wales' data should go on but Jenny Boag felt that all the Scotland data, including travel to study data collected in Scotland in 2001 but not in England & Wales, should also be placed on the website.
- 7.8 There were no further comments on this paper.

**(b) 2011 Census Progress Report– PAMS (07) 06**

- 7.9 Paul Fensom introduced himself to the group and then he and Neil Jackson took the group through their paper on the 2011 census update. Neil Jackson added that the 2006 census test evaluation paper is now published on the GROS website.

**Post meeting note:** 2006 census test evaluation can be accessed on the following link [<http://www.gro-scotland.gov.uk/census/censushm2011/2006-census-test/2006-census-test-evaluation.html>]

- 7.10 Alistair Harvey asked whether enumerators were aware of which forms included an income question and was informed that they were not.
- 7.11 Paul Fensom told the group that the 2011 census design was now completed. An internet version of the form will be available for the census. There will also be a local post back system rather than collection by an enumerator and forms will be hand-delivered to most people but not to those in remote or dangerous areas. Jan Freeke asked what the current thinking was on whether the form would be 3 or 4 pages long. This was unknown but the extra cost involved in a 4 page form may mean a 3 page form would be chosen. Sherie Nichol asked when a summary of the consultation events would be available and was informed by Neil Jackson that this will be published on the GROS website early September 2007. Esther Roughsedge asked where the rehearsal will be held. Paul responded that a decision has yet to be made on this but it will not include areas in the 2006 test.
- 7.12 Jenny Boag mentioned that census liaison officers in councils were pleased to have been mentioned in the RG's letter to councils.
- 7.13 There were no further questions on this paper.

**(c) 2011 Population definitions and bases for the census – PAMS (07) 07**

- 7.14 Neil Jackson ran through his paper and informed members of the group of the issues and the current thinking on population bases and definitions for the 2011 census. He mentioned that people had been missed in the 2001 census in England & Wales due to the 'usual residence' population base used. This had led to the plan to ask additional questions regarding visitors. GROS are still unsure how much this will help, particularly with regard to issues in determining whether someone was not counted at their usual residence. There is also concern that information may be lost if someone does not complete their own form where they have been counted elsewhere as a visitor and there is a further issue around hospital visitors.

- 7.15 Richard Belding felt that the wording in section 4.1 was inconsistent as the definition appears to exclude houses rented to students by private landlords whilst wording below this includes otherwise ordinary houses owned by a private landlord only available for rental to students.
- 7.16 Jenny Boag said that she seemed to recall the number of people visiting hospitals and Young Offender Institutes being recorded in the 1991 census.

**Post meeting note:** After the meeting an error was identified in paper PAMS (07) 07. The following note from Neil Jackson was issued to PAMS members:

“PAMS members,

I have to draw your attention to an error in paper PAMS (07) 07, regarding population definitions for the Census, which I presented to the 26th June meeting. I stated in section 5.3 that the population estimates count armed forces at their duty address, where this differs from their normal family address. This is incorrect - the definition currently used by population estimates is the same as that for the Census, namely to count armed forces at their family home regardless of where they live when they are on duty (change in armed forces populations, are however, estimated with reference to 'duty address'). However, the Population Estimates Unit at ONS, who compile the estimates for England and Wales, would like to be able to count armed forces at both their family home address and where they live when they are on duty. This would be achieved by using the second address questions proposed for the 2011 Census.

My apologies for this error, and thanks to Richard Belding for pointing it out.”

- 7.17 Jenny Boag added that Local Authorities needed a count of visitors and counts of second residences and mentioned a figure quoted recently that 16% of new housing stock is for second homes. Thomas Robertson questioned the source of this figure and Jenny Boag agreed to investigate this.

**Action: Jenny Boag**

- 7.18 Jan Freeke asked whether communal establishments would be broken down by type of establishment and was told that they would be.

- 7.19 There were no further comments on this paper.

## **8 Non-Census Issues (continued)**

### **(a) Household Estimates and Projections Update – PAMS (07) 03**

- 8.1 Esther Roughsedge ran through her paper and asked whether there was a need to revise household projections given that the new projections will be published in 6 months. Jenny Boag offered to e-mail local authority representatives to ask their views.

**Action: Jenny Boag**

- 8.2 There were no further comments on this paper.

### **(b) Improving Migration and Population Statistics (IMPS) Project Update**

- 8.3 This had already been covered to some extent under the review of International Migration. Jim Newman gave some further explanation of the LFS calibration of the IPS and mentioned that visitor and migrant switcher methodology had changed as had the way in which migrants were distributed from country / GOR level to local authorities.

## **9 Information on migrants**

- 9.1 It was decided to take this forward at a bigger meeting on this subject. Jenny Boag informed the group that there had not been many suggestions from the morning meeting beyond worker registration and private accommodation data (the latter however would not pick up private rented where most A8 migrants were).

## **10 Local Authority Projections of Disabled Populations – PAMS (07) 04**

- 10.1 Jan Freeke informed the group that the paper was for information only. The next stage is the evaluation of datasets and methodologies. A new module for POPGROUP will be produced as part of the work. Esther Roughsedge said that she would be interested in the outcome of the study and Jan Freeke agreed to give an update at the next PAMS meeting.

**Action: Jan Freeke**

- 10.2 There were no further comments on this paper.

## **11 OCS Update**

- 11.1 Members were handed an update on progress with the SPSCC as Janette Purbrick was unable to attend the meeting. PAMS members were asked to note the paper and send any comments to the secretary.

## **12 Proposal for PAMS seminar**

- 12.1 There was general agreement to holding a PAMS seminar in early November and ideas for this were requested.

**Action: All**

## **13 Any other business**

- 13.1 Sherie Nichol asked about the rationale for producing population projections for national parks. Esther Roughsedge explained that since national parks are planning authorities GROS would be more or less obliged to do this although health warnings would be placed on this data. Sherie Nichol asked if it would be possible to produce projections for the Highland and Islands Enterprise area.

## **14 Date of next meeting**

- 14.1 The next meeting will be held in November 2007 and the secretary will consult members for possible dates in due course.