

Report of the 2001 Census Debriefing Seminar

*"A review of 2001 and looking towards 2011 - a perspective
from different sectors - what was good, what went less well
and what users want for the future"*

Held on

Monday, 10th April 2006

at

**Greater London Authority, City Hall, The
Queen's Walk,
More London, London, SE1 2AA**

SaSPaC



JISC



MRS



**General Register Office
for
SCOTLAND**
information about Scotland's people



**national
STATISTICS**



**Northern Ireland
Statistics &
Research
Agency**

Introduction

This jointly sponsored seminar was very well attended with nearly 150 persons present on the day (see Appendix 2 for a delegate list). These were drawn from a wide spectrum of users of Census data, with the majority being from the local authority sector. The large attendance was a reflection of the importance that both users and the Census Offices attach to the necessity of ensuring that dialogue is opened and maintained in the run-up to the 2011 Census. There were many positive statements to this effect during the day and it was heartening to see the large number of Census Offices staff who attended the event.

A programme outlining the seminar can be found in Appendix 1. Presentations on the day, which are all available at <http://www.saspac.org/2001debrief.html>, were given by representative of users from all the major sectors, as well as from the Census Offices. This report was circulated to all speakers and discussants for comments prior to its publication.

Following a welcome by **Rob Lewis (Greater London Authority)**, **Keith Dugmore (Statistics Users Forum)**, who was the Chair for the morning session, gave a brief introduction to the day. **Jil Matheson (ONS)** then gave a brief talk on how the Census Offices were approaching the 2011 Census Programme and how seminars such as this were an important element of the overall plan.

Geography

The first presentation of the morning session was given by **Professor David Martin, University of Southampton and ESRC/JISC Census Programme**. Its theme was [Geography](#), and covered the strengths of the method adopted by ONS and NISRA in defining the Output Areas (OA) that were used as the basic area for which data were made available. It also addressed the acknowledged shortcomings of such a system, and the need to overcome these without losing the major benefits. Dave also proposed that workplace or business OAs could be created that were disaggregations of standard OAs where appropriate. In response, **Steve Turner, Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit**, gave a [Local Authority perspective](#) on the issues arising from the automated OA

creation procedure. This presentation highlighted the fact that different users have different needs, in that a geography based on Postcodes was acceptable to academics and the private sector, but caused great difficulty to local authorities where communities were of prime importance. The automated procedure had in many cases divided communities while at the same time uniting diverse communities.

In the general discussion which followed these presentations several issues were raised. Most of these reinforced the diversity of need, and highlighted the difficulties faced by the Census Offices in trying to balance the needs of users against Disclosure Control issues and data protection.

Robin Howick (Experian) commented that the problems with OA boundaries arose more from issues of Disclosure Control rather than any inherent weakness in the Postcode structure. He felt that it was important to keep the link to Postcodes.

Chris Hanson-Kahn (Surrey County Council) considered that setting a minimum size that took into account the issues of Disclosure Control would have obviated some of the problems that arose to which **Professor Martin** responded that at the stage of designing OAs, there was no information available as to the amount of Disclosure Control that was to be applied.

Hugh Neffendorf (Katalysis) put forward the idea of individual address records with Disclosure Control approved software to produce aggregates. He also raised the option of using grid squares as the basic building block.

Wendy Pontin (Norfolk County Council) stated that, for rural areas, Parish geography is very important.

Sheila Ritchie (Manchester City Council) said that it would have been helpful if they had been given sight of the boundaries before they were finalised, so that they could have given ONS advice based on local knowledge of the areas.

Jenny Boag (Falkirk Council) explained that the Scottish experience of Postcode based geography was positive, and that Falkirk Council had taken advantage of GROS' offer to comment on the proposed boundaries with the result that theirs were totally redrawn. However, not all Scottish local authorities took up the offer, with the result that across Scotland the OAs have been developed differently, depending on the consultation (or lack of it) beforehand. **Frank Thomas (GROS)** added that Postcodes were first used to define OAs (or

Enumeration Districts (EDs) as they were then called) in 1981 (and 1971 data were reworked to these new areas). The 1991 OAs were based on the 1981 EDs and the 2001 OAs were based as much as possible on the 1991 OAs. **Martin Callingham (Birkbeck College)** wondered how Scotland could have lower thresholds on their small areas without applying any Disclosure Control, to which **Jane Longhurst (ONS)** replied that perceptions of risks were different and that the Census Offices were planning for a UK wide standard to be applied in 2011. **Robin Howick (Experian)** added that evidence of any Disclosure Control contraventions in Scotland would be available in advance of the 2011 Census, and **Ian Cope (ONS)** concluded the topic by saying that there would be further discussion of Disclosure Control later in the day.

Eileen Howes (Greater London Authority) commented that there has to be a trade-off between the richness of the data and the size of the output areas, since the smaller the areas became, the greater the risk of losing information through Disclosure Control measures. **Greg Ball (Birmingham City Council)** added that the problem was that different people had different views as to how and where this trade-off would operate.

Richard Price (Experian) felt that stability of area definitions might be a red-herring – as long as the Census Offices output basic 2001 data to the 2011 boundaries, then a measure of continuity could be achieved.

Alan Barton (Department for Transport) asked **Steve Turner** what would be his ideal geography, to which the response was – *one that enables Local Authorities to have access to as accurate a set of data as was possible, based on housing blocks.*

Alistair Calder (ONS) summed up the issues by stating that there is a lot of common ground on geography planning, and that ONS is heading in the direction of stability with a view to re-using much of the 2001 geography. He accepted there were weaknesses at neighbourhood level, but there is often disagreement as to exactly which communities are important to identify and as to how they should be described.

Data Issues

The first presentation on the theme of Data Issues was given by **Eileen Howes (SASPAC/Local Government)** and covered [Data Delivery](#). In her presentation she covered many of the problems that had arisen firstly through the adoption by the Census Offices of SuperTable as the data delivery vehicle, and secondly by the application at a very late stage of the Disclosure Control rules. Among her pleas to the Census Offices were requests for:

Standard Datasets and Nationally comparable data

Users to assist with QA on the data before general release

Table layouts to be agreed in advance and adhered to

A method of Disclosure Control that is agreed with users

Small Cell Adjustment to be built into the database and not applied on a table by table basis

All data to be made available as flat CSV files

Data for administrative areas i.e. wards and parishes

Richard Price (Experian) expressed total agreement with Eileen's requirements and comments, and also paid great appreciation to **Chris Ashford (ONS)** who had been extremely helpful in ensuring that all data supplied by ONS was in the required flat CSV format.

Robin Howick (Experian) said that one of the major problems arising from the manner in which Small Cell Adjustment had been applied was that there were no national totals available for checking aggregation of OAs into customised areas.

David Martin (ESRC) indicated that colleagues at Manchester University had faced the same issues as those faced by the SASPAC team in unravelling the datasets provided by the Census Offices and putting them into a more user friendly format. It is vital that a culture of trust is built up between the Census Offices and the re-suppliers of the data.

Muriel Hickson (BT) hinted at the unfriendliness of SuperTable by asking "*What is it for?*", to which **Chris Denham (Ex ONS)** replied that while he was not going to get into a session of defending SuperTable, the 2011 output would not be in the 2001 format and was expected to be more web-friendly.

The second presentation on the theme of Data Issues was given by **John Hollis (Lead of CLIP Local Government Census Group)** and covered [Statistical Aspects](#). In his presentation he dealt with issues arising from different definitions of usual residency, and how separate components of the population related to those definitions. The lack of adequate address lists, and the use of the “One Number Census” procedure had caused several problems, not only in Westminster and Manchester. Among his pleas to the Census Offices were requests for:

Improved liaison on address lists between the Census Offices and Local Authorities

Consistency/Harmonisation across the whole of the UK for Key Questions

Proper application of the “One Number Census” principle

Early and clear guidance on the application of Disclosure Control

Consistent Databases – one value the same in all tables where it appears

Jo Wathan (Cathie Marsh Centre for Census and Survey Research) gave an indication of plans for the 2011 Sample of Anonymised Records (SAR) and emphasised the need to build on the 2001 work, and the fact that there needed to be early and clear guidance on Disclosure Control.

Richard Alldritt (Statistics Commission) commented that devolution had moved on, and so the case for harmony has to be made by users and not assumed.

Jenny Boag (Falkirk Council) said that many Scottish Census questions were messed up by the Scottish Parliament and harmonisation could cause issues for Scottish users. She added that taking space on the form to cover definitions of second homes and ‘split’ children could be detrimental to other questions, with questions such as those relating to cars/vans being downgraded.

Ian White (ONS) added that there is a European initiative to try to use Censuses to improve migration statistics, and so definitions may be driven by EU guidance.

Chris Denham (Ex ONS) said that there was a danger of overburdening the public with the inclusion of very detailed questions, such as those relating to second homes.

Ian Cope (ONS) commented that there would be further discussion of the use of address lists later, and added that the cost of the 2011 Census is a constraint which may lead to some user requirements not being met.

Sheila Ritchie (Manchester City Council) spoke of Manchester and the undercount that was experienced there. The QA had shown that the Census was an undercount, but ONS had initially ignored this. She felt that the principles of the One Number Census were valid, but had not been adhered to by ONS.

The third presentation on the theme of Data Issues was given by **Tony Champion (University of Newcastle)** and related to [2001 Census Interaction Data](#). It was based on joint work with **Oliver Duke-Williams** and **John Stilwell** (both **University of Leeds**). The main theme of the presentation was that whilst the 2001 data was an improvement on 1991, there were very serious issues raised following the implementation of Disclosure Control, and especially the Small Cell Adjustments that were applied. Inconsistencies between tables (and in comparison with Theme Tables) were introduced, and aggregations of areas produced inaccurate results.

Ian Williams (WSP Group) closed the session on Data Issues by looking at the [use of census data](#) from a private sector viewpoint. The issues faced by the private sector were the same as those faced by the public sector and the academics, and the requirements for 2011 again concentrated on prior discussion of Disclosure Control procedures.

Martin Callingham (Birkbeck College) said that whereas the local authority to local authority data was useful, ward to ward was patchy due to varying sizes, and OA to OA was not useful because areas were so small and therefore cell entries were numerically small leading to Small Cell Adjustments. He felt there is a need for users to be able to create settlement to settlement data flows, and he also raised the option of coding migrants by the demographics of their origin and destination.

Jenny Boag (Falkirk Council) pointed out that in Scotland there were no issues with Small Cell Adjustments, and that data for catchment areas for schools could be created with no loss of information. Additionally, specific areas such as Travel to Work areas could be created.

Simon King (ONS) asked that details be supplied by users who would have liked to have been able to make decisions based on the Origin/Destination data, but were

unable to because of the inaccuracies introduced by the Small Cell Adjustment procedures.

Keith Dugmore (Statistics Users Forum) indicated that in many cases OAs were too large to be considered as workplace zones as they are specifically created for residence purposes. Areas in the City of London, and large airports such as Heathrow are prime examples of this.

Frank Thomas (GROS) repeated his contention that Small Cell Adjustments led to the broad equivalent of a series of 33.33% samples, which is an improvement on the 10% sample of 1991.

Jane Longhurst (ONS) completed the discussion by stating that the Census Offices were working on a consistent UK-wide policy on Disclosure Control, and this would consider issues such as what is an acceptable level of risk and how can this be achieved. It would also take into account a whole range of options following discussions with all concerned.

Outputs, Access and Licensing

The next theme addressed by the seminar was that of Outputs, Access and Licensing. **Barry Leventhal (Market Research Society, Census and Geo-demographics Group)** gave a [presentation](#) of [work](#) undertaken jointly with **Peter Sleight (Association of Census Distributors)**. Again, many of the issues were as experienced by users in other sectors, with the problems of 'bulk delivery' being a major cause of headaches, and the late introduction of additional disclosure control leading to doubts as to the usefulness of some of the data. A plea was made for better error tracking and management systems within the Census Offices. Additionally, the late availability of specially commissioned tables meant that some of the information had lost its currency and therefore its usefulness. There was, however, one issue that was specific to the Association of Census Distributors and the private sector. That was the problem with the Ordnance Survey agreement on OA boundaries and their re-supply by the VARs to their customers. The Census Offices were asked to consider this issue in their planning for 2011.

As discussant on this theme, **Chris Denham (ex-ONS)** responded that now as a member of the general public, he was interested in getting Census data on his home

desktop along with the relevant maps. From 1961 to 1991, there was a gradual loss in what was generally available as printed output, (and therefore directly available to the public), and an increase in the quantity of specialised (machine-readable) output. This culminated in 2001 in the Census Access Project (CAP) and the concept of the Click-Use licence. For 2011 there may be an option of continuing with the CAP. Alternatively, (to meet the requirements of the 1920 Census Act), all standard output could be presented as downloadable Reports to Parliament, for access both in Parliamentary Libraries and to users generally. Other options for consideration would be to have a first tranche of (basic) data available very quickly, but to use further tranches more flexibly to meet the emerging needs as well as those recognised in advance of the Census. The Census Offices should enter into partnership with VARs to strengthen the value of the Census, and to undertake rehearsals with 2001 data.

Russell Harris (Department for Transport) asked if it could be possible to have an on-line table commissioning service that would be instantaneous, to which **Garnett Compton (ONS)** replied that it would depend on disclosure control decisions and hence the feasibility of implementing a standard disclosure control routine.

Robin Howick (Experian) predicted that if web delivery was the only option, there would be a spike in demand, so there was a need for bulk delivery as well.

David Martin (ESRC) proposed the concept of the data as a datastream that was capable of being used in different ways by different users.

Humphrey Southall (University of Portsmouth) asked if the Census Offices had profiles of users of their website, to which the Census Offices replied that the only information they had related to those that had contacted Census Customer Services.

Wendy Pontin (Norfolk County Council), Jenny Boag (Falkirk Council), and Chris Hanson-Kahn (Surrey County Council) all said that they supplied the public via their own web sites, but that they needed bulk delivery first, while **Greg Ball (Birmingham City Council)** considered that the complexity of the data and the ONS web site were a barrier to public web access to the Census data.

Looking towards 2011

The final session of the seminar was presented by **Ian Cope (ONS)**, who gave full details of the manner in which the three Census Offices (ONS, GROS, and NISRA) are [approaching the 2011 Census](#), including a reference to the [agreement](#) between the Registrars General. Amongst the issues raised was the development of high quality address lists in conjunction with OS and IDEA, and agreement on Disclosure Control mechanisms which minimise disclosure risk whilst maximising data utility.

Jil Matheson (ONS) commented that the message from ONS is that they are committed to getting it right, and to ensure that there will be no late surprises on anything.

Wendy Pontin (Norfolk County Council) welcomed the discussions on Disclosure Control and added that perception is the main concept of the risk of disclosure, but perception of inaccurate data is probably more important.

Steve Turner (Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit) welcomed the suggestion that there might be licensed access to lower level high detail data, although **Keith Dugmore (Statistics Users Forum)** felt that such a move could be seen as elitist. **Ian Cope (ONS)** commented that safe access data laboratories were being tested and that such access was already available within ONS Sites for both Business data and Census data Business Statistics.

Panel Session

The seminar was concluded with a panel session chaired by **Hugh Neffendorf (SASPAC)**. The members of the panel were **Richard Alldritt (Statistics Commission)**, **Jil Matheson (ONS)**, **Keith Dugmore (Statistics Users Forum)**, and **Hywel Davies (CensusSense)**.

During the panel session the following points were raised:

Keith Dugmore

Good points from 2001:

- Census Access

- Licensing arrangements
- Move to new geography linked to postcodes
- Data on web

Less good

- Disclosure controls
- Delays
- Delivery – referring specifically to the csv output that could have been better

Future – like to see:

- Integration of data with other data sources all wedded to postcode geography
- Postcode admin records in NeSS
- Only change geography if really have to
- NeSS drop to OA from SOA
- Click use licence to cover OS

Hywel Davies

Future – like to see:

- Fixed product specification – say what it is and stick to it
- Fix data output strategy at early stage
- Accept necessary to make change but ensure correct management procedures implemented correctly with audit control
- Create correct metadata
- UK harmonisation
- Disclosure control that is clearly defined in advance so that user expectations can be managed.
- Segmentation/user spectrum – large range of users and needs from Jo public to ACD/Academics and public sector.
- Linkage to statutory needs of LA and other areas
- Stability in data and geography
- Census offices working with users so each side knows what the other wants
- Staff swapping and secondments
- Quality assurance by users

Richard Alldritt

The Commission is concerned that funding must be right and are planning to do research in 4 strands:

- a) Role of the census in managing public services and the core future user requirement
- b) Risks facing 2011 Census – funding/ politics/dependency - Census dual system estimator
- c) Consultation process must reach those making important decisions using Census data
- d) Written briefing for all Parliaments/Assemblies in UK on why Census is important

Jill Matheson

- Like to engage with CEOs etc now rather than later if and when there is a problem. ONS will need help in ensuring we talk to the right people
- Trade offs will be judgements – i.e. it will be a challenge to get the geography that everyone wants
- Guide to length of questionnaire and need to give something back to everyone who fills in form. No point if information collected is not used
- Funding is built on basis of user needs and minimising risk of getting it right for 2011
- ONS will be articulating what we understand as user needs in next few weeks. Also need to give indication of the impact if no Census.
- Discussions need to start early

Appendix 1

2001 Census Debrief Seminar Programme – Monday 10th April 2006

“A review of 2001 and looking towards 2011 – a perspective from different sectors – what was good, what was less good and what users want for the future”

Organised by SASPAC, MRS, ESRC/JISC Census of Population Programme, RSS/SUF, ACD – in liaison with ONS/GROS/NISRA.

9:30 Tea/Coffee Reception

10:00 Introduction/Scene Setting

Welcome: Rob Lewis (Greater London Authority)

Morning Chair: Keith Dugmore (Chair, Statistics User Forum)

Introduction: Jil Matheson (ONS)

10:20 Geography

Speaker: Dave Martin (Academic) Discussant: Steve Turner (Local Govt)

11:20 Data Issues

A) Data delivery

Speaker: Eileen Howes (SASPAC/Local Govt)

B) Statistical Aspects

Speaker: John Hollis (Lead of CLIP Local Govt Census Group)

12:20 Lunch

Afternoon Chair: Hugh Neffendorf (SASPAC)

13:20 Data Issues (continued)

C) 2001 Census interaction data: retrospect and prospect

Speaker: Oliver Duke-Williams, Tony Champion and John Stillwell
(Academic)

Discussant (Data Issues): Ian Williams (WSP Group)

14:00 Outputs, Access and Licensing

Speaker: Barry Leventhal (ACD/MRS)

Discussant: Chris Denham (ONS Census output to March 2006)

15:00 Tea/Coffee

15:20 ONS/GROS/NISRA - Looking towards 2011

Speaker: Ian Cope (ONS)

15:45 Panel session

Members:

Richard Alldritt - Chief Executive, Statistics Commission

Hywel Davies - CensusSense

Keith Dugmore - Chair, Statistics User Forum

Jil Matheson – Director of Economic and Social Reporting Directorate, ONS

16:30 Summary/Close

Appendix 2

Delegate list:

No.	Name	Organisation
1	Stewart Dickson	Acxiom (Royal Mail PAF User Group)
2	Michael Doocey	AGMA Policy & Research Unit
3	Samantha Weaver	Alliance Pharmacy
4	Janet Hayden	Anglia Ruskin University
5	Sharla Gorsia	Association of London Government
6	Martin Callingham	Birkbeck College
7	Greg Ball	Birmingham City Council
8	Mick Marlow	Birmingham City Council
9	Elise Carroll	Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council
10	Jason Houghton	Brentwood Borough Council
11	Jenny Cooper	British Waterways
12	Carolyn Matthews	BSS
13	Derek Lynch	BT
14	Dominic Sherry	BT
15	Tim Dickson	BT
16	Muriel Hickson	BT
17	Jon Mitchell	Bureau Veritas UK & Ireland
18	David Landeryou	BURISA
19	Jon Burton	Cabinet Office
20	Carolyn Valder	CACI Ltd
21	Sheena Murchie	CACI Ltd
22	Jo Wathan	Cathie Marsh Centre for Census and Survey Research
23	Hywel Davies	CensusSense
24	Lesley Aalbers	City of London
25	Sumit Rajput	CMC Limited
26	Andrew Rudd	Commission for Rural Communities
27	Alex Clark	Concensus
28	Alex Barton	Department for Transport
29	Russell Harris	Department for Transport
30	Steve White	Dorset County Council
31	Chris Lawton	East Midlands Development Agency
32	Maura Badoni	East Sussex County Council
33	Pamela Dow	Edelman
34	Roger Newman	Edelman
35	Stefan Fleckenstein	Edelman
36	James Crone	EDINA UKBORDERS
37	Richard Price	Experian
38	Robin Howick	Experian
39	Jenny Boag	Falkirk Council
40	Jennifer Beaumont	Government Office for the East of England
41	Alan Lewis	Greater London Authority
42	Rob Lewis	Greater London Authority
43	John Hollis	Greater London Authority
44	Eileen Howes	Greater London Authority

No.	Name	Organisation
45	Giorgio Finella	Greater London Authority
46	Gareth Piggott	Greater London Authority
47	Lorna Spence	Greater London Authority
48	Valerie West	GROS
49	Frank Thomas	GROS
50	Peter Scrimgeour	GROS
51	Simon Brown	Hampshire County Council
52	Allen Williams	Harris Corporation
53	Bill Hageman	Health and Social Care Information Centre
54	Charlotte Devereux	Herefordshire Council
55	Steve Paul	Hertfordshire County Council
56	Liz Heal	Higher Education Funding Council for Wales
57	Caroline Bowles	Hillingdon Primary Care Trust
58	John Walker	JRW Solutions
59	Hugh Neffendorf	Katalysis
60	Del Herridge	Kent & Medway Health Informatics Service
61	Debbie Clark	Kent County Council
62	Yong Lee	Kent County Council
63	Alan Brooks	LB Hammersmith & Fulham
64	Pete Gisborne	Learning and Skills Council
65	Austin Dalby	Learning and Skills Council
66	Ciaran Guilfoyle	Leicester City Council
67	Russell Taylor	Leicester City Council
68	Robert Radburn	Leicestershire County Council
69	Paul Botterill	Leicestershire Fire and rescue Service
70	Sally Brooks	Local Government Data Unit - Wales
71	Thomas M. Kuba	Lockheed Martin
72	John Stewart	Lockheed Martin
73	Christopher Chester	Lockheed Martin
74	Robert Hudson	LogicaCMG Public Sector Division
75	Chris Sale	London Borough of Barking and Dagenham
76	Doug Ogilvie	London Borough of Bromley
77	Neil Storer	London Borough of Camden
78	David Walker	London Borough of Camden
79	Sally Burrows	London Borough of Ealing
80	Emma Williams	London Borough of Greenwich
81	Frederick Nuer	London Borough of Redbridge
82	David Gann	London Borough of Southwark
83	Patrick Whitter	London Borough of Sutton
84	Matthew Keep	London Borough of Sutton
85	Justin Sylvester	London Borough of Tower Hamlets
86	Lavinia Irving	London Borough of Tower Hamlets
87	Christine Pollard	London Borough of Wandsworth Borough
88	Phil Jeffries	London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority
89	Janet Rudge	London Metropolitan University
90	Julian Buxton	London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine
91	Sheila Ritchie	Manchester City Council
92	Alison Peacock	Manchester Diocesan Board for Ministry & Society
93	Barry Leventhal	Market Research Society

No.	Name	Organisation
94	Les Johnson	Mott MacDonald Ltd (Integrated Transport Birmingham)
95	Gareth Bevan	Mott MacDonald MIS
96	Rosalia Munoz-Arroyo	NHS National Services Scotland
97	Robert Beatty	NISRA
98	Sinclair Sutherland	NOMIS
99	Wendy Pontin	Norfolk County Council
100	Colin Bainbridge	North Yorkshire County Council
101	Geoff Oxendale	Nottingham City Council
102	Shirley Swann	ONS
103	Louisa Blackwell	ONS
104	Chris Denham	ONS
105	Stephanie Draper	ONS
106	Simon King	ONS - 2001 Census Team
107	Judy Hawkins	ONS - 2001 Census Team
108	Sue Taylor	ONS - 2001 Census Team
109	Peter Benton	ONS - 2011 Census Team
110	Garnett Compton	ONS - 2011 Census Team
111	Ian Cope	ONS - 2011 Census Team
112	Angele Storey	ONS - 2011 Census Team
113	Ian White	ONS - 2011 Census Team
114	Kay Sumpner	ONS - Census Customer Services
115	Jil Matheson	ONS - Economic and Social Reporting Directorate
116	Alistair Calder	ONS - Geography
117	Nick Stripe	ONS - Geography
118	Paul Jackson	ONS - Legal
119	Jane Longhurst	ONS - Methodology
120	Owen Abbott	ONS - Methodology Division
121	Callum foster	ONS - NESS
122	Richard Mason	Ordnance Survey
123	John Hume	Pebbleshore
124	Peter Furness	Peter Furness Limited
125	Caroline Hancock	Reading Borough Council
126	Dr Justin Varney	Regional Public Health Group - London
127	Matthew France	Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council
128	Roger Morgan	Royal Borough Kensington and Chelsea
129	Nicola Weaver	Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
130	Sue Goddard	Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead
131	Charlotte Hopley	Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead
132	Sean Phelan	Royal Mail
133	Richard Hynes	Royal Mail
134	Kelly Marshall	Safer Merton
135	Helen Harvey	Shropshire County Council
136	Ruth Hudson	Shropshire County Council
137	Philip Eadie	South East England Intelligence Network
138	Mark Sheppard	Southend on Sea Borough Council
139	Jennifer Pacheco	Southwark PCT
140	Richard Alldritt	Statistics Commission
141	Keith Dugmore	Statistics User Forum
142	Sheila Quan	Steer Davies Gleave

No.	Name	Organisation
143	Chris Hanson-Kahn	Surrey County Council
144	Emma Fordham	Swindon Borough Council
145	Steve Turner	Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit
146	Trevor Sumption	Tendering District Council
147	Les Taylor	TNS
148	Mike Collop	Transport for London
149	Joe Stordy	Transport for London
150	Kathy Sayer	University of Essex - Census Registration Service
151	Oliver Duke-Williams	University of Leeds - School of Geography
152	Tony Champion	University of Newcastle
153	Humphrey Southall	University of Portsmouth
154	David Martin	University of Southampton (ESRC/JISC)
155	Karen Barnes	Watford Borough Council
156	Samantha Brown	Westminster City Council
157	Neil Tiley	Wiltshire County Council
158	Bela Sandu	Wolverhampton City Council
159	Ian Williams	WSP Group
160	Brian C. Edgill	
161	Peter Mitchell	
162	Hugh Bridge	