



General Register Office
for
SCOTLAND
information about Scotland's people



Scotland's
Census 2011
Shaping our future

Scotland's 2011 Census
Spring 2010 Consultation on Statistical Outputs:
Analysis of Responses

20 October 2010

Acknowledgements

General Register Office for Scotland (GROS) would like to thank the individuals and organisations who contributed to this consultation.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	4
2. Background to the Consultation	4
3. The Consultation Process	5
4. Consultation points: summary of responses (and GROS commentary)	8
5. Next steps in the consultation process	18
Annex A – List of consultation respondents	19
Annex B – Summary of user feedback from the Spring 2010 Census Outputs Consultation Roadshows	21
Annex C – Suggestions for new pre-defined tables, including those based on new questions in the 2011 Census	23
Annex D – Suggestions for new derived variables from the 2011 Census	30

1. Introduction

This report provides a summary of responses to the spring 2010 consultation about initial plans for statistical outputs from Scotland's 2011 Census. The remainder of the report is organised into a number of sections and annexes:

- Section 2 – background to the consultation
- Section 3 – description of the consultation process
- Section 4 – summary of responses submitted on each consultation point (including a GROS commentary)
- Section 5 – outline of further stages in the consultation process
- Annex A – list of consultation respondents
- Annex B – summary of user feedback from the four consultation roadshow events
- Annex C – user suggestions for new pre-defined tables
- Annex D – user suggestions for new output derived variables

2. Background to the Consultation

The General Register Office for Scotland (GROS) carries out the census of population every 10 years in Scotland. The data collected about the characteristics of people and households in the country is widely used by central and local government, health boards and many other organisations to allocate resources and plan for future services.

As part of its preparations for the 2011 Census in Scotland, GROS conducted a formal consultation round in spring 2010 about its initial plans for how the statistics from the census will be published. The consultation provided an opportunity for users to help shape the main statistical outputs from the census and to comment on a range of related issues. It also enabled GROS to update users on the progress being made across a number of areas bearing on its plans for producing and disseminating the census results.

The consultation was intended to provide the basis for developing an agreed set of final specifications of the main outputs from the 2011 Census that meet the needs of a majority of users and make the best use of the data collected. It sought views from users on a number of specific consultation points, including:

- pre-defined tabular outputs;
- comparisons of 2001 and 2011 census results;
- data delivery formats;
- outputs geography – including which intermediate geographies users wanted results produced for; and
- priorities for the order of release of the 2011 Census output products.

The spring 2010 consultation was the third and final round of formal 12-week consultations on all aspects of the census; further details can be found in the [preparations](#) section of the GROS website.

An outline of the next stages in the consultation process is given in [Section 5](#) below.

3. The Consultation Process

Introduction

The spring 2010 consultation was launched on 18 February 2010 and closed at the end of May 2010. It was run as a web-based consultation, with the consultation document and supporting background material placed within the [census consultation section of the GROS website](#).

Consultation Document

The consultation document set out the background to the consultation, including details of previous consultations, topics on which views were being sought and progress on other areas related to 2011 Census outputs.

Respondents were asked to consider and comment on 11 specific consultation points, including:

- any current difficulties in accessing and working with 2001 Census data;
- a set of initial proposals for pre-defined census output tables;
- suggestions for new cross-tabulations of census information;
- any specific data delivery requirements;
- the need for any new intermediate output geographies;
- demand for an additional outputs geography based on workplace;
- potential new technical solutions for accessing census data; and
- priorities for the order of release of census output products.

The supporting material included an Excel file which listed a set of initial proposals for pre-defined census output tables; the list was based on the tables produced following the 2001 Census. Entries on the list could be filtered by topic of interest, and each one could be linked to the 2001 version of the table (populated with Scotland level data) and to screenshots of the relevant underlying questions proposed for the 2011 Census. A template for respondents to use in submitting their comments was also provided in order to make the job of collating and analysing them easier. (Responses were, however, also accepted by email or through the post.)

Promotion of the Consultation

GROS recognised that it was vital to ensure that the consultation reached as wide a range of users as possible. The consultation document and supporting material was therefore published on the GROS website in order to make it open for anyone to respond. When the consultation was launched, all those included in the GROS census consultation database (nearly 1,400 contacts in total) and others who had registered a previous interest in the census were sent an email alert with the relevant web links to the consultation material. Members of ScotStat (the Scottish Government's statistical consultation network) were also contacted and sent these links, while notices announcing the launch of the consultation were placed on a number of websites, including Scotland's Census, Scotland's Census Results Online (SCROL), the 2011 UK Census Output Consultation and the Office for National Statistics. The consultation launch was also highlighted at a number of different census stakeholder meetings.

These email alerts and website notices also invited users to a series of consultation roadshow events. These events, held in Aberdeen, Edinburgh, Glasgow and Inverness during late April and early May 2010, attracted around 160 people overall. They aimed to provide a general update on the planning and preparations for the 2011 Census, some background to the outputs consultation process and a technical demonstration of some of the functionality being contemplated for the system to disseminate Scotland's 2011 Census results. As well as promoting a general awareness of the census and providing an opportunity for direct discussion of particular issues, the roadshows were designed to encourage participation in the main consultation on an informed basis.

The consultation was therefore widely trailed through a combination of email alerts, notices on web pages and references at census stakeholder meetings.

Responses and Respondents

In total, 43 responses to the consultation were submitted. Submissions were mainly made using the response template provided on the consultation page on the GROS website, though a small number were also received by email and through the post.

Each respondent was assigned to one of six (GROS-defined) categories. In the analysis of responses, this gave a broad indication of the variety of user interest and requirements. These categories were:

- Central Government – including Scottish Government
- Local Government – respondents from Local Authorities (LAs) within Scotland
- Local Service Providers – mainly in the health sector
- Business & Commercial
- Community & Special Interest Groups
- Other Academic – those associated with universities
- Individuals

The profile of respondents is summarised in Table 1 and a list of individual respondents (who were happy for their response to be made publicly available) is given in [Annex A](#). Both the number and variety of respondents are considered healthy for a consultation of this kind. Some respondents were covering the views of a wider community of census users, e.g. the Demographics User Group which represents a number of commercial and business users.

Table 1: Profile of Respondent Type

Type of respondent	Number of responses
Central Government	4
Local Government	16
Local Service Providers	7
Business and Commercial	6
Community and Special Interest	6
Other, including academic researchers and individuals	4
Total	43

The four consultation roadshow events held across Scotland attracted a good turnout and generated a lot of questions and comments about the general preparations for the 2011 Census, about plans for the design of census outputs and about plans for disseminating the census results. A summary of the feedback from the roadshows which is relevant to the consultation about statistical outputs is given in [Annex B](#).

Analysing responses

Counts of those responding to each consultation point were based on the number of valid responses only. Respondents who left a consultation point blank or had written 'no comment', 'no opinion', 'not applicable' or 'don't know' were excluded in the analysis.

If a response was submitted which did not answer the consultation point(s) directly, it was treated as a general comment on the issue surrounding that particular consultation point.

Some comments were located under the wrong consultation point. These were transferred to the correct consultation point for inclusion in the analysis.

Interpretation of findings

A wide range of users were able to respond to the consultation exercise, the intended purpose of which was to give those wishing to comment on GROS' initial plans for 2011 Census output products an opportunity to do so. Those replying did so voluntarily, each with their own particular motivation and interpretation of the issues involved. It should also be kept in mind that while the consultation was open to anyone who wished to respond, it will tend to have captured the views of established census users, predominantly those working in organisations such as local authorities, health boards and elsewhere who already make significant use of census data. There will be other types of user, for example some voluntary groups or members of the general public, who perhaps have made relatively less (or no) use of census information in the past. They will not necessarily have been aware of the consultation (or if they were, perhaps less inclined to submit a response) and their needs will also need to be borne in mind as the 2011 Census output products are developed.

4. Consultation points: summary of responses (and GROS commentary)

This section sets out a summary of the responses received on each of the 11 specific points included in the main consultation document. It does not attempt to provide a readout of every single comment submitted - rather it aims to provide an overall reflection of the feedback obtained. Similarly, the content of the 'GROS commentary' attempts to provide an update on our current thinking on each area and on the approaches being developed for the 2011 Census outputs.

Consultation Point 1: do you have any continuing difficulties in accessing or working with 2001 Census outputs? Are there any specific points you want to (re-) make in connection with the set of 2001 Census output products?

User Response

Twenty-one responses were received on this consultation point, with most noting no continuing difficulties with outputs from the 2001 Census.

The difficulties that were identified included:

- Lack of flexibility when using SuperTable to create special or non-standard geographies (the most prominent issue – mentioned by a third of respondents). SASPAC was referred to as providing a more intuitive approach.
- Bulk data delivery - CSV output from SuperTable was not user friendly – required a lot of manual intervention to get the data into a usable format.
- Poor quality and availability of metadata.
- Lack of detailed information on ethnicity and religion on SCROL.
- Inconvenient having to go to separate websites for each of the UK countries to build the UK-wide picture; and a lack of UK comparability for some outputs.

GROS commentary

We recognise that there is a significant demand from users for a flexible geography tool within the census outputs dissemination system that will allow them to create and save their own geographies. The intention is therefore to provide this functionality in the 2011 Census dissemination system, provided that the software currently being procured will support it.

The difficulties with SuperTable output in CSV format have now been resolved.

GROS recognises that the 2001 Census metadata fell short of user expectations. The aim is therefore to improve considerably on this aspect for 2011, including harmonising metadata on a UK basis.

The aim is to release as much detail in the 2011 Census results as possible, including on ethnicity and religion, subject to ensuring that the statistics are anonymised.

GROS continues to work closely with the other UK census offices with the common aim of producing consistent, coherent and accessible UK-wide statistics from the 2011 Census. Consideration is currently being given to options for how best to achieve that aim.

Consultation Point 2: you are invited to review the list of tables and then (with supporting reasons please): identify any tables you think are no longer useful; suggest changes to existing tables to improve their usability; comment on any 2001-2011 comparability issues envisaged.

User Response

Fifteen responses were received on this consultation point.

The comments included:

- retain all tables down to output area level where the questions and the need for anonymity allow.
- a small number of suggestions for specific tables no longer considered useful or which could more helpfully be redesigned.
- the set of univariate tables provided in 2001 proved very useful and should be repeated for all questions (and classifications) in the 2011 Census.
- the set of key statistics tables could more usefully show counts rather than, or as well as, percentages.

Some potential comparability issues due to changes in the question set were identified, for example in relation to the questions on ethnic background, housing amenities, qualifications and in the definition of those working away from home.

GROS commentary

A decision has yet to be made on the extent to which pre-defined tables will be produced in 2011. This is dependent upon the need to ensure anonymity and the potential availability of a flexible tabulation tool that will allow users to define their own tables from information held in datacubes. However, our aim is to cater for different types of user, including those who seek a range of pre-defined tables similar to those provided for 2001 Census data.

Anonymity may be breached by providing counts in the key statistics tables due to level of detail that can be provided at small area geography. However, we will investigate how to meet this need while preserving anonymity.

Every effort will be made to maintain comparability with 2001. However, changes to some of the questions between 2001 and 2011 mean that certain variables will only be comparable at a high level. Similarly, changes over time in the underlying set of census output areas or in the boundaries for higher geographies will constrain some comparisons. Any comparability issues and resulting limitations on how the data can be used will be clearly flagged to users within the metadata.

Consultation Point 3: thinking particularly of census questions that will be new in 2011, please put forward your suggestions for additional tables to include in the pre-defined set, identifying (with supporting reasons) those you would like to see included as a priority.

User Response

A total of 19 comments were received on this consultation point, including:

- the set of univariate tables should be extended to include all new questions.
- suggestions for a variety of new pre-defined tables, including those based on new questions in the 2011 Census. (A full list of these suggestions is included at [Annex C.](#))
- suggestions for some new derived variables (A full list of these suggestions is included at [Annex D.](#))

GROS commentary

The intention is that all data from all new questions will be covered in the set of univariate tables.

We will endeavour to meet all user requests for tables involving the new census questions and for new derived variables, subject to preserving anonymity. The quality of the data obtained from the new questions will also need to be assessed, but any limitations will be made clear within the relevant metadata. In the meantime, data from the 2009 Census Rehearsal is being used to trial the various suggestions made for new tables.

Consultation Point 4: are there any specific data delivery requirements that you would like to be taken into account?

User Response

Forty responses were received on this consultation point. Almost all respondents noted they expected their main access to census results to be online via SCROL (or a successor dissemination system). Half of the respondents also noted a requirement for the bulk supply of census outputs data in CSV format. More than half of the respondents had a requirement to receive bulk supply of census output tables on DVDs in order to allow for offline working. Some 15 per cent of respondents noted they had no such requirement as they expected that online access would cover all their needs. Around 5 per cent of respondents said they would only require data to be provided on DVD if the detailed small area data was not available online.

The majority of respondents stated they had no requirement for the publication of hardcopy paper reports, or suggested publication of online reports only. There was only one specific request for publication of hardcopy reports.

Other responses made on this point included:

- demand for a flexible table generation service
- more census data to be available via the Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics website
- census outputs dissemination system to feature an improved mapping tool
- geo-referencing to be provided alongside the data so that it can be easily imported into GIS packages
- metadata should be better linked to the data.

GROS commentary

The current thinking is that DVDs with bulk supply of census output tables will be produced on request (as opposed to producing a stock upfront). This will reduce waste, as many of the CDs produced for the 2001 Census outputs lie unused on storage shelves. This process will also allow for tighter version control.

It seems likely that only online reports will be produced, apart possibly from a Scotland reference volume and the Census Report to the Scottish Parliament – though the latter may also be presented electronically rather than in printed form.

The aim is to provide a flexible tabulation tool as part of the census outputs dissemination system, though the amount of flexibility that can be offered will be dependent on preserving the anonymity of the statistics.

Consideration is currently being given to incorporating a wider range of census information into the Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics website.

Suitable mapping functionality has been included in the statement of requirements for the software currently being procured to build the 2011 Census outputs dissemination system.

The suggestion for including geo-referencing information along with the census outputs data will be considered further.

Consultation Point 5: do you foresee any disadvantages with the proposed general approach to geography described for 2011 Census outputs?

User Response

Twenty-three responses were received on this consultation point, with the great majority (over 85 per cent) supporting the proposition that the approach taken to census output geography for the 2001 Census had worked well and should be retained for the 2011 Census.

Similarly, there were many comments emphasising the importance of maintaining comparability with the range of higher geographies produced for the 2001 Census outputs.

Strong requirement was noted for a postcode to output area index so that the core headcounts for both postcode and administrative geographies can be created.

GROS commentary

GROS will repeat the general approach taken in the 2001 Census for output geographies. Output areas will continue to form the building bricks for census outputs for all higher geographies. They will be of similar size and threshold to 2001 with as high a degree of comparability as possible to the set of 2001 output areas. Some output areas may have to be merged (where they have dipped below confidentiality thresholds), while others may have to be split (e.g. when new housing has taken them above maximum thresholds). Changes since 2001 in local authority and locality boundaries will also need to be taken into account.

Consultation Point 6: are there any additional intermediate geographies for which you would like to have pre-defined census outputs available, and why? Are any of the existing intermediate geographies no longer useful to you?

User Response

Thirty-three responses were provided on this consultation point.

A strong requirement was noted for:

- Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics datazones – to allow census data and non-census data to be more easily used in combination on a common geography.
- Community Health Care Partnership – mentioned as a key geography for health improvement and for local health care.
- Multi-member wards - and the higher geographies derived from these, including neighbourhood partnerships, neighbourhood management areas, community planning areas, Westminster & Scottish Parliamentary constituencies.

Some requirement was noted for:

- User-defined intermediate geographies, e.g. school catchment areas and council areas excluding areas within a National Park (because some council functions are carried out by the relevant National Park Authority).
- geographies available on Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics website e.g. NUTS.

A limited requirement was noted for:

- civil parishes
- settlements and localities
- postcode sectors
- 2001 wards
- inhabited islands.

GROS commentary

GROS aims to accommodate user needs for census output intermediate geographies as far as is possible. It is therefore proposed to provide standard census outputs for all the intermediate geographies produced for the 2001 Census, apart from 2001 wards (to avoid the potential confusion with multi-member wards). The issue of breaching anonymity through differencing will also be monitored and taken into account. It is hoped that the new census outputs dissemination system will also have the functionality to allow users to create and save their own output geographies (from aggregations of census output areas).

Consultation Point 7: subject to its feasibility, would you find value in having available a small area geography for reporting workplace data, and why?

User Response

There were 26 responses on this consultation point. (It has been assumed that the remaining 17 respondents who did not provide a response found no value or were neutral about having this type of additional output geography available.)

The strongest interest for having this type of output geography available came from business and commercial respondents, together with a few from local and central government. Other respondents either saw some advantages in having a separate workplace geography but did not view it as essential, or felt it was not particularly relevant to their needs.

The potential uses cited by respondents in favour of an outputs geography based on workplace included generating workplace profiles, drive time and travel pattern analysis, understanding where employment opportunities are taken up and by whom, planning workplace-based health improvement and spatial planning in general.

GROS commentary

The demand for an output geography based on workplace appears to be strongest from the business and commercial sector, who are mainly also likely to be users of UK-wide census data. As ONS is looking into the feasibility of developing a work place geography for England and Wales, this is something that GROS intends to pursue in the context of UK census outputs. The costs and feasibility of creating such a geography for Scotland will have to be considered against other priorities.

Consultation Point 8: please note any other specific requirements you have in relation to geographical issues for census outputs?

User Response

Fourteen responses were received on this consultation point.

There was a very high demand, particularly from local and central government respondents, for any census outputs dissemination system to allow users to

customise new geographies and save them for re-use. In addition, it was suggested that an interactive mapping tool be provided to allow users to specify boundaries of interest to them and which would have built-in disclosure checking to reflect the detail of data that could be made available for different levels of geography.

There was a suggestion that a means be provided to allow users to sub-divide output area level data on a ratio or percentage basis where the output area boundaries did not match exactly with users' own small area geographies.

Some respondents asked that local authorities and other expert users be given the opportunity to comment on any design limitations of individual output areas in the set created for the 2001 Census.

There was a request that shape files be provided in advance of, or in conjunction with, census data releases to allow immediate mapping of the data using GIS software.

GROS commentary

There is clearly high demand for functionality within any census outputs dissemination system to allow users to create and save their own geographies. This is therefore something we would aim to provide if at all possible. An improved mapping tool was included as a requirement for the software tools currently being procured to build the 2011 Census outputs dissemination system.

The request for a means of sub-dividing output area level data on a ratio or percentage basis has been noted but is still to be considered in detail. At this stage this is unlikely to be a priority area for development.

The consultation currently being run by the Scottish Government in relation to Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics data zones asks users to identify any of the 2001 Census output areas which they feel have design limitations (and which could therefore be taken into account in the creation of output areas for the 2011 Census).

The feasibility of providing shape files along with census data releases will be considered.

Consultation Point 9: do you have any priorities for the order of release of particular census output products?

User Response

Twenty-six responses were received on this consultation point, with most commenting that the release timetable for output products after the 2001 Census was logical and should be adopted for the 2011 Census.

It was commented that budgets, reports and information given to the public based on census data placed great reliance on that data being correct. Thus, while a speedy release of census results was to be encouraged, delivering to a pre-

announced release timetable without the need for subsequent releases of revised data was viewed as being just as, if not more, important.

There was a fair amount of consensus in the responses that the (descending) priority order of release for census output products should be along the lines of:

- population estimates (by age/sex) for local authority and health board areas;
- univariate tables at output area level;
- postcode to output area Index; digital boundaries for output areas;
- Census Area Statistics tables at output area level; output area to higher area index;
- look up table for changes to output areas between 2001 and 2011, i.e. mergers, deletions, additions; and
- Standard Tables.

Some users noted the importance of having a concurrent UK release of census outputs, for some having UK-wide data available was the key thing.

GROS commentary

The scope and order of release for the 2011 Census output products have still to be defined in detail. The working assumption is that they will be produced in a similar order to 2001 Census. The earlier tables are generally used to carry out integrity checks on the later, more complex tables.

It is proposed that, following the first release of the 2011 Census results, further releases of more detailed output products will follow as soon as possible (and no later than the corresponding timings that were achieved for the 2001 Census). An outline outputs prospectus and draft release timetable will be issued to users for comment in spring 2011.

Consultation Point 10: are there any other points you want to make in relation to the developing GROS plans for the 2011 Census outputs?

User Response

A number of respondents took the opportunity to express their disappointment at the decision by the Scottish Parliament that a question on household income should not be included in the 2011 Census. There were comments on the range of analysis which had been fore gone as a result, and that many Scottish Government policies and guidance e.g. in relation to housing strategy could have benefited greatly from the availability from the census of analyses of household income data by a range of other characteristics on households and individuals.

A variety of comments and suggestions were made, including:

- the set of pre-defined census output tables should include those which would be particularly difficult to produce on SCROL, such as employment tables, or the theme tables.

- a registration service within the 2011 Census outputs dissemination system that allows certain users greater access to detailed data (in effect a registered end-user licence set-up).
- send out alerts to users as new data released – this was found to have been helpful in 2001.
- the importance of UK comparability across census outputs, and a concurrent UK release of census results.
- the availability of data at small area level was seen as being very important for strategic and service planning, as well as for policy development - noted by some local government respondents.

Some concerns were raised about the possibility that there may not be another census after 2011. It was thought important that the type of information currently collected in the census should be collected in some form beyond 2011.

GROS commentary

In the absence of a census question on household income, it may be possible to create a proxy measure, though the feasibility of this has still to be considered.

Decisions have yet to be made on the balance between what census statistics will be provided to users as pre-defined tables, what information users will be able to generate for themselves from a flexible table generation service and what information will only be available through a commissioned tables service. These decisions in turn will be influenced by the need to preserve anonymity in the statistics generated by any flexible table generation service. With such a service there may be less requirement to produce the same volume of pre-defined tables as were provided for the 2001 Census. However, the needs of all the different types of user will need to be taken into account, and there are certainly a significant number of respondents who in effect have said 'same as for 2001' in relation to the range of pre-defined tables to be produced for the 2011 Census.

The suggestions for a registration service and user alerts (which are potentially a good way of keeping in touch with census users) are interesting ones that we will pursue.

The comments about the need for UK comparability in census outputs, and of the importance to local authorities and others of small area statistics from the census are well made, and loom large in our thinking as we develop plans for the 2011 Census outputs.

No decisions have been taken about the future of the census in Scotland after 2011.

Consultation Point 11: do you want to draw our attention to new technical solutions which would help us make census data more accessible to you or other users?

User Response

A number of comments were made, notably:

- Strong demand that data provided as comma separated value (CSV) files should include column headers to describe what each column of data represents.
- Suggestion that GROS should consider publicising the arrival of the census data to a wide range of users and the public by using mash-ups, possibly using Google Earth and OS mapping and perhaps enlisting help from academic and other innovative partners.
- The push being given by Eurostat and others to the use of Application Programming Interfaces (API) was mentioned as something that may become increasingly important in the future, though with two caveats: a) the data content should retain primacy over the dissemination technology - the use of datacubes should not reduce the amount of detail in the data made available; and b) publication of the results should not be held back for technological developments to come on-stream.
- If feasible, providing outputs in GIS for specialist users would be useful, e.g. some local authorities have a lot of non-census spatial data already stored in GIS (from a variety of sources) which could then be combined with census data and layered using GIS to get an enriched statistical picture of local areas.

GROS commentary

We are aware of the need to improve on all aspects of metadata for the 2011 Census outputs, including providing CSV files with appropriate column headers.

Using an API-based approach for the dissemination of Scottish census data is not something that GROS is planning to embrace at this stage. However, we recognise the importance of enabling easy access for users to consistent UK-wide census results and of the potential benefits to UK data users from external partners and web developers being able to access census statistics through an API. The current intention in our outputs strategy is to provide a feed of Scottish census data to ONS for inclusion in a consolidated UK census database, which will be accessed using an API.

There appears to be a strong view that users would prioritise detail over flexibility in terms of obtaining census data. Therefore, if anonymisation means that datacubes would be more restricted in content (compared with 2001) than pre-defined tables, users would prefer dissemination via the latter.

The detail of what would be involved in providing geo-referencing for GIS packages will be considered further. However, improved mapping features are very much part of the plan for the new census outputs dissemination system and this functionality should go some way to meeting this user need.

5. Next steps in the consultation process

Publication of this summary analysis concludes the formal spring 2010 consultation round on the initial GROS plans for statistical outputs from the 2011 Census. However, there will be further opportunities for census users to provide feedback as work moves on to develop these plans in more detail, and the next stages of the consultation process are outlined below.

GROS would in the first instance welcome any user reaction to the content of this consultation analysis, either from those who submitted responses (to correct any misreading of their comments or to provide further feedback in light of comments made by others) or from anyone else.

GROS will produce draft outlines of pre-defined (or Standard) tabular outputs for the 2011 Census, including suggestions received for new cross-tabulations. These draft outlines will be published on the GROS website early next year (provisionally February) for users to provide further comment.

Work will also be carried out in parallel, and together with the other UK census offices, on the specification of comparable UK-wide outputs. If possible, we will include draft outlines of UK table specifications to accompany the Standard table specifications early next year. We will also scope and design datacubes to underpin a flexible table generation service. The full scope of what can be offered via data cubes will be subject to statistical disclosure constraints (as yet unknown) and the functionality available from the software currently being procured to build the 2011 Census outputs dissemination system.

Once GROS has completed the procurement, integrated and tested the software in the GROS environment, our aim is to issue, around May/June 2011, a baselined prospectus of Standard and UK output products for the 2011 Census, with an associated dissemination timetable for each product type. That dissemination timetable will be built around the product release order which users requested in the spring 2010/early 2011 consultations

As noted in the section 4.5 of the [consultation document](#), proposals for the specification of the microdata files for the 2011 Census, and the associated access and licensing arrangements, are currently under development. Users with an interest in this aspect of census data may be interested to read a report commissioned by the University of Manchester: 'A business case for microdata files from the 2011 Census' - <http://www.ccsr.ac.uk/sars/2011/documents/businesscase.pdf>

Annex A – list of consultation respondents

Name	Organisation Name	User Category
Tom Snowling	Aberdeen City Council	Local Government
Tom McCann	Angus Council	Local Government
Chris Carr	Argyll and Bute Council	Local Government
Simon Whalley	Beacon Dodsworth	Business & Commercial
Peadar Morgan	Bòrd na Gàidhlig	Community & Special Interest Groups
John Rae	CACI	Business & Commercial
Gavin Miles	Cairngorms National Park Authority	Community & Special Interest Groups
Fiona Collie	Carers Scotland	Local Service Provider
Iain Bell	City of Edinburgh Council	Local Government
Kathleen Shirkie	Comhairle nan Eilean Siar	Local Government
Andy Dobson	David Simmonds Consultancy	Business & Commercial
Keith Dugmore	Demographics User Group, representing commercial users	Business & Commercial
Mette Tranter	Directorate of Public Health and Health Policy, Lothian NHS Board	Local Service Provider
Richard Price	Experian	Business & Commercial
Jennifer Boag	Falkirk Council	Local Government
Andrew Ballingall/Clare Campbell	Fife Council/NHS Fife	Local Government
Jan Freeke	Glasgow City Council	Local Government
Tina Callan	Glasgow City Council Social Work Services	Local Government
John O'Dowd	Greater Glasgow and Clyde NHS Board	Local Service Provider
Donna Hosie	GROS Customer Services	Central Government
Alastair Macbeth	Helensburgh Study Group	Community & Special Interest Groups
Alison Clark	Highland Council	Local Government
Heather Smith	Highlands and Islands Enterprise	Central Government
Fiona Geddes	Housing Strategy Officer, The Moray Council	Local Government
Lin Murray	Inverclyde Council	Local Government
Diane Stockton	ISD Scotland	Local Service Provider
Anne Jackson	Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park Authority	Community & Special Interest Groups
Dr Barry Leventhal	MRS Census & Geodemographics Group	Business & Commercial
Kenneth Emerson	NHS Ayrshire & Arran	Local Service Provider
Dr Laurence Gruer	NHS Health Scotland	Local Service Provider
Lesley Mann	North Lanarkshire Council	Local Government

Name	Organisation Name	User Category
Florence Edmond	RNID Scotland	Community & Special Interest Groups
Leah Granat	Scottish Council of Jewish Communities	Community & Special Interest Groups
Lindsay Bennison	Scottish Government - Justice Analytical Services	Central Government
Louise Gall	Shetland Islands Council	Local Government
Gordon Dickson	Strathclyde Partnership for Transport	Local Service Provider
Hannah Jones	The Open University in Scotland	Academic
Stephen Cragg	Transport Scotland - Technical Analysis Branch	Central Government
Margo Houston	East Ayrshire Council	Local Government
Alistair Gemmell	West Dunbartonshire Council	Local Government
Ludi Simpson	n/a	Other
Mark Keenan	n/a	Other
Professor Michael Anderson	n/a	Other

Annex B – summary of user feedback from the Spring 2010 Census Outputs Consultation Roadshows

There were various queries and comments raised at the four census consultation roadshow events about all aspects of the census, including fieldwork and other procedures for the actual enumeration, the content and associated guidance of the census questionnaires and procedures for imputing missing results. The points summarised below were those that related more directly to plans for the design and dissemination of the census outputs. These were a useful supplement to the feedback obtained through the main consultation and will all be taken into consideration as the plans for 2011 Census outputs are developed in more detail.

Output content

- All the information collected in the census should in principle be published.
- Interest in data on Eastern European migrants split by occupation – more topical than it was in 2001.
- Breakdowns of numbers of deaf and non-deaf people who use British Sign Language (BSL) – useful information in relation to numbers of interpreters in different parts of Scotland.
- Useful if data could be produced in formats that are compatible with local authority systems.
- Separate counts of numbers of overseas students would be of interest.
- Write-in responses for relevant questions should be coded and released as part of the standard outputs, for example on the number of people who write in 'Pagan' for the question on religion.
- While embracing new innovative technologies for dissemination is to be encouraged, GROS should not lose sight of getting the basics right e.g. providing free and easy access to CSV files.
- Interest in when first release of 2011 Census results will be published, and what it will include.
- GROS needs to refine the corrections policy: in the past too many revisions caused confusion and frustration for users who returned to find data had changed with little explanation.

Geography

- Request for local authority involvement in the design of the 2011 Census output areas.
- Request that the boundaries of census output areas should align with the boundaries of any redrawn Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics (SNS) datazones.
- Requests for national parks and settlements as intermediate geographies.
- Interest in the point at which the outputs geography for the 2011 Census will be frozen – useful for users to know so that they can start working with it.
- Interest in whether a feasibility study of creating an outputs geography based on workplace will be carried out.
- It would be useful to have a link between frozen geographies and live geographies.

- Send the CAS files to local authorities and they will create relevant and useful shapefiles for GROS to use.
- SNS Datazones are required – useful for comparison with the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD).

Dissemination

- Interest in the software technology GROS will use for its 2011 Census outputs dissemination system.
- The vast majority of users will have their own software for producing charts/graphs (e.g. Excel) therefore GROS's main focus should be on producing a high quality mapping feature.
- It would be useful for a prototype of the 2011 Census outputs dissemination system to be made available to users ahead of the results being published so that they could become familiar with its functionality and provide feedback on this where appropriate.
- Will training on how to use the new software be provided?
- Any contractual issues involved in the possible use of Google Maps?
- Improvements need to be made to the mapping function in SCROL.
- The UK census offices should aim to create a harmonised look and feel for their census dissemination systems.
- The 2011 Census outputs dissemination system should generate percentages as well as numbers.
- Would be useful if analysis can be run off the maps rather than using area codes within a table which are often meaningless.

Recurrent points

- Very important that religion and ethnicity breakdowns are more accessible in 2011 than they were in 2001 – only way of gaining in-depth data was through requests for information to GROS customer services.
- Big requirement for the ability to customise and save geographies – GROS should also monitor what is being built so that a record of the types of geographies users require is created.
- Being able to compare 2011 with 2001 is very important so that changes over time can be identified.
- Greater flexibility required - monitor flexible tabulation usage to keep a record of the types of outputs users are creating.
- Will the dissemination site also be produced in Gaelic?
- Support for the potential ability to carry out more detailed flexible analysis.
- UK level outputs are required - however GROS needs to prioritise comparability with rest of UK within the context of what is appropriate for Scotland?
- Interest in combining summary census data with information from other sources, e.g. the Scottish Recreation Survey.

Annex C – suggestions for new pre-defined tables, including those based on new questions in the 2011 Census

Core variable	Cross tabulated with/ broken down by:		
Time living in the UK (derived from month and year of last arrival in UK for overseas born people)	age	sex	
	age	ethnic group	national identity
	cars or vans, number available to household		
	country of birth		
	economic activity		
	ethnic group		
	ethnic group	English, fluency in spoken	language used at home
	household size	household type	
	household type	rooms in household	
	language proficiency		
	languages		
	living in a household or communal establishment		
	national identity		
	qualifications		
	qualifications	occupation	
	qualifications	English, fluency in spoken	
	religion		
	socio-economic group		
	tenure (of dwelling)		

Core variable	Cross tabulated with/ broken down by:		
National identity	age	sex	
	country of birth		
	economic activity		
	ethnic group		
	household composition		
	languages		
	limiting long-term health problem or disability	type of long-term health condition	
	qualifications		
	religion		
Type of long-term health condition	age	sex	
	economic activity		
	ethnic group		
	general health		
	religion		
	tenure (of dwelling)		

Core variable	Cross tabulated with/ broken down by:		
Limiting long-term health problem or disability	age	sex	
	age	sex	ethnic group
	carer, provider of unpaid		
	carers, number in household		
	cars or vans, number available to household		
	dwelling type		
	dwelling type	economic activity	
	economic activity		
	ethnic group		
	general health		
	living in a household or communal establishment		
	religion		
	socio-economic group		
	tenure (of dwelling)		
type of long-term health condition			
Deaf or partial hearing loss	age		
	age	sex	economic activity
	British Sign Language user		
	country of birth		
	economic activity		
	qualifications		
	tenure (of dwelling)		
	time living in UK (overseas born)		

Core variable	Cross tabulated with/ broken down by:		
Questionnaire return method (paper or internet)	age	sex	
	time living in UK (overseas born)		
Visitors	age	sex	
	country of residence (grouped by UK and non-UK)		
	distance from own address		
English language ability	age	sex	
	country of birth		
	ethnic group		
	limiting long-term health problem or disability	type of long-term health condition	general health, age and sex
Provider of unpaid care	age	sex	
	age	sex	hours worked
	approximated social grade of household reference person (HRP)	age	sex
	ethnic group		
	type of long-term health condition	age	sex
No. of unpaid care hours	sex	economic activity	
Central heating type	tenure (of dwelling)	dwelling type	
	limiting long-term health problem or disability	type of long-term health condition	general health
	household composition		

Core variable	Cross tabulated with/ broken down by:		
Use of language other than English at home	age	sex	
	ethnic group	country of birth	
Gaelic	age	sex	ethnic group
	all equality measures in detail		
Religion	age	sex	
	ethnic group		
	general health	limiting long-term health problem or disability	type of long-term health condition
	qualifications		
General health	age	sex	
Employment status	cars or vans, number available to household	mode of transport to work	
Name	age		
	country of birth		
	ethnic group		
	national identity		
	religion		
	sex		

Core variable	Cross tabulated with/ broken down by:		
Lifestage (adults) ¹	basic counts		
	dwelling type		
	questionnaire return method		
	socio-economic group		
	tenure (of dwelling)		
Lifestage (households) ²	basic counts		
	dwelling type		
	questionnaire return method		
	socio-economic group		
	tenure		
	multi-variate analysis to look at aspects of households of unrelated people, multi-generation families etc.		
Workplace population	cars or vans, number available to household		
	ethnic group		
	industry		
	language used at home		
	mode of travel to workplace		
	occupation		
	qualifications		
	religion		
	sex		
	tenure (of dwelling)		

¹ Suggested new derived variable – see Annex D.

² Suggested new derived variable – see Annex D.

Core variable	Cross tabulated with/ broken down by:		
Household counts	age of household reference person (HRP)		
	country of birth of HRP	household composition	age of HRP
	English, fluency in spoken of HRP		
	ethnic group of HRP		
	ethnic group of HRP	household composition	age of HRP
	national identity of HRP	household composition	age of HRP
	over-crowding measure		
	tenure (of dwelling)		
Communal establishment counts	sex		
Transport Scotland's Land Use Model Household types	cars or vans, number available to household		
	economic activity		
	mode of transport to work or study	socio-economic group	
	occupation		
European migrants	occupation		
Overseas students	multi-variate analysis		
Equivalent to ONS UV067: households by selected characteristics - measure of deprivation	employment, education, general health & disability, and housing characteristics		
Equivalent to ONS UV001: total population			

Annex D – suggestions for new derived variables from the 2011 Census ³

- Income proxy
- Kinship, adoption and foster relationship type
- Mother’s education level (for households with mother and dependent children)
- Students who cross an LA border to attend school
- Time in the UK: born in UK, 0-1 years, 2-4 years, 5-9 years, 10+ years
- Lifestage (household) ⁽¹⁾
- Lifestage (adult) ⁽²⁾
- Method of return of questionnaire (paper or internet)
- Expanded national identity
- General health categories grouped for greater comparability with 2001
- Transport Scotland's Land Use Model Household types
- Visitors by aggregated usual country of residence
- Visitors split by UK/non UK usual residence
- Visitors by an appropriate set of age bands
- Households where the Household Reference Person has never worked
- Overseas students
- Main language

(1) Age of Household Reference Person and household composition	(2) Age of adult and household composition
16-24: no dependent children	16-24: no dependent children in household
16-24: with dependent children	16-24: dependent children in household
25-34: no dependent children	25-34: no dependent children in household
25-34: with children aged 0-4	25-34: children aged 0-4 in household
25-34: youngest child aged 5-10	25-34: youngest child in household aged 5-10
25-34: youngest child aged 10-15	25-34: youngest child in household aged 10-15
35-54: no dependent children	35-54: no dependent children in household
35-54: with children aged 0-4	35-54: with children aged 0-4 in household
35-54: youngest child aged 5-10	35-54: youngest child in household aged 5-10
35-54: youngest child aged 10-15	35-54: youngest child in household aged 10-15
55-74: single person household	55-74: in single person household
55-74: 2+ persons, no dependent children	55-74: in 2+ person household, no dependent children
55-74: with dependent children	55-74: in household with dependent children
75+: single person household	75+: single person household
75+: 2+ person household	75+: 2+ person household

³ Some suggestions arose from a round of internal consultation within the Scottish Government.