

<p>A. A reconciliation should be performed between the full NINO data scan received and the NIRS system to ensure that the dataset is complete and accurate as a baselining exercise. The team should then continue to perform the incremental checks for each quarter.</p>	<p><b>Action Taken:</b> reconciliation with HMRC MI was undertaken in 2008 and has been reviewed. Bi-annual reconciliation processes are now in place with HMRC and embedded into sign-off mechanisms.</p> <p><b>Implementation date:</b> July 2010</p>
<p>B. The team should work with HMRC Accenture to resolve the issue of data scans losing records to ensure that the historic data received each quarter matches the frozen dataset.</p>	<p><b>Action Taken:</b> investigations show that each quarter a very small number of cases disappear (less than 50 from the cumulative 3million plus records). This does not change reported National Statistics and partly reflects the complexities in processing administrative data whose primary purpose is not the production of statistics.</p> <p><b>Implementation date:</b> September 2010</p>

<p>C. Data extracts for the same time periods for the NINO and WRS statistics should be obtained and a full comparison and trend analysis performed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the two sets of data match and gain some external assurance regarding the NINO statistics.</li> <li>• To establish and quantify the known differences to allow the team to perform a quarterly comparison factoring in known differences.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action Taken:</b> building on work carried out both as part of the initial 2008 Quality Assurance exercise and some ongoing quarterly assessment, analyses and documentation of the NINO_WRS comparisons have been build into the quarterly process and step-by-step guide for each release. Comparisons may be in the form of 12month rolling averages and will account for definitional differences (e.g. UK v GB) where practical</p> <p><b>Implementation date:</b> by end May 2010</p>
<p>D. The nationality fix and geocoding SAS programs and the related MS Excel workbooks should be reviewed by a separate member of the team following the quarterly updates to the scripts and formulae.</p>	<p><b>Action Taken:</b> process has been built into the quarterly guide with 2<sup>nd</sup> signatory sign-off and to include code changes to stage 6 of the geocoding allocations and review of the nationality fix</p> <p><b>Implementation date:</b> by end May 2010</p>

<p>E. The DT4 team process checklist should be expanded to include all process steps, QA checks and reviews that are performed (including proofreading) and the checklist should be completed in full for each quarterly process.</p> <p>The checklist should capture who performed each stage, who reviewed it and relevant dates. The team leader should perform the first or second review of each process stage where possible.</p>	<p><b>Action Taken:</b> a more comprehensive checklist has been developed &amp; implemented.</p> <p><b>Implementation date:</b> August 2010 annual release of statistics</p>
<p>F. When the quarterly NINO data scan is received from HMRC Accenture, dialogue should be performed with the relevant HMRC teams to capture whether any issues with the system or dataset that may impact the NINO statistics have occurred in the quarter, such as the NIRS system experiencing downtime. This dialogue could be formalised as part of the technical specification documentation.</p>	<p><b>Action Taken:</b> discussions taking place with HMRC around operational/technical issues impacting on NIRS. Agreed these could be formalised and brought into the quarterly process cycle.</p> <p><b>Implementation date:</b> by end July 2010</p>

<p>G. An appropriate geographical sample of NINO records should have the address fields compared to the geocoded output to verify that the geocoding program is as accurate as possible. The results should be documented and reviewed by the team leader.</p>	<p><b>Action Taken:</b> 100 sample addresses from the raw scan assessed against the geocoded outputs each 6 months and reviewed. Process is embedded into the checklist process</p> <p><b>Implementation date:</b> by end July 2010</p>
<p>H. A defined audience of relevant policy team contacts should be created and relevant NINO statistics report chapters sent to them for comments. The policy teams should be requested to perform a QA of the relevant chapters as well as inserting the sections of commentary they are responsible for.</p> <p>A central repository should be created to track the comments received and action taken.</p>	<p><b>Action Taken:</b> in time for 2010 Annual Report preparation. A Stakeholder matrix, log of comments, and action taken has been developed and centrally housed.</p> <p><b>Implementation date:</b> by end August 2010</p>
<p>I. When the DT4 team sends out the Submission for Ministers, the Briefing for the Prime Minister and the Core Brief publications, they should be sent to the customer base as read-only PDF documents, rather than MS Word documents.</p>	<p><b>Action Taken:</b> implemented.</p> <p><b>Implementation date:</b> by 27<sup>th</sup> May 2010</p>