Census 2011 Ethnicity, National Identity, Language and Religious Affiliation questions
Equality Impact Assessment: Action Plan
Last updated: 19 April 2010

	Identified Issue	When identified (by whom)	Equality groups which are most likely to be affected	Sources of evidence used to assess impact	Proposed actions/ Recommendations	Actions to be taken EIIT= Ethnicity, Identity and Inequalities Team	Progress against action 🟢 Completed 🟠 Underway 🔵 Not yet started 🔴 Action falling behind – bring to attention of High Level Design Board (HLB)
1	**ALL:** All majority and minority communities are affected by the Census. The primary purpose of the Census is to provide an accurate count of the population. Accurate, reliable data about ethnic groups, language and religion is an essential part of the planning process, to help ensure equality of outcomes for all diverse communities. Census information includes, for example, the numbers of women, disabled people and people of different age groups within distinct communities. National identity data will help to enrich the ethnic group data. Census Outputs, or results, rely on the willingness of all UK households to provide a range of personal information. The reliability of Census Outputs depends on individuals giving responses that best reflect themselves, even when they would prefer to have a question asked in a different way.	November 2007 (Diversity Solutions)	All communities, including majority and minority ethnic communities; and groups within communities.	n/a	To ensure that any potential for adverse impact is identified and mitigated, it is recommended that ONS works with organisations such as the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) to do the following: a) determine which minority groups face discrimination and disadvantage to a such a degree that full Census Outputs should be produced; and b) advise public bodies in particular areas where to expand their monitoring categories on ethnicity, language, national identity, religion and belief, to enable them to take account of the needs of vulnerable and disadvantaged communities in their localities.	**1.1 EIIT:** Arrange meetings with the EHRC (including Scottish and Welsh offices) biannually and when necessary (next meeting planned Autumn/Winter 2008) throughout Census process. **1.2 EIIT:** Arrange meetings with the National Statistics ethnicity and identity harmonisation sub-group from 2009 3 or 4 times a year **1.3 EIIT:** Keep under review what other organisations we could be working with. Ongoing **1.4 Census Outputs:** Determine which minority groups should have full Census Outputs produced by winter 09 (see also action 5.2) **1.5 EIIT**: Advise public bodies where to expand their monitoring categories by Dec 09 (see also action 11.1)	🟠 **1.1** Meetings held April 2008 and June 2008 to discuss specific concerns with Census. No further meetings planned 🟢 **1.2** Regular meetings and communication between harmonisation sub-group members on an on-going basis during the course of the harmonisation programme. Project completion expected Spring 2011 🟠 **1.3** To review at meetings with EHRC. Always on-going through various stakeholder groups 🟠 **1.4** The relationship between disclosure control and outputs is currently being investigated. Once a full understanding of the relationship has been reached, consideration will be given to whether standard outputs relating to small populations can be produced. 🟠 **1.5** Incorporated into harmonisation programme. Guidance to be published in Spring 2011 🟠

	Identified Issue	When identified (by whom)	Equality groups which are most likely to be affected	Sources of evidence used to assess impact	Proposed actions/ Recommendations	Actions to be taken EIIT= Ethnicity, Identity and Inequalities Team	Progress against action 🟢 Completed 🟠 Underway 🔵 Not yet started 🔴 Action falling behind – bring to attention of High Level Design Board (HLB)
2	**ALL:** Limited space is available on the Census form, which means that some communities and groups will have tick boxes and others must write in their answers in the 'Other' box. A key aim of ONS consultations is to ensure that the questions are acceptable to the greatest number of people from all communities and groups. Response rates will be reduced if the questions are not accepted, or people do not understand why they are asked.	November 2007 (Diversity Solutions)	All communities, including majority and minority ethnic communities; and groups within communities.	n/a	It is recommended that guidance is provided with the ethnicity, national identity, language and religion questions, to help people understand why the questions are asked, and how the results are used. (See also recommendation 16)	**2.1 EIIT**: Provide material to **Stakeholder Management** on user need for questions in August 2008 **2.2 Stakeholder Management:** Use guidance in community liaison project Autumn 2008 **2.3 Community liaison:** Target Population Working Group to lead on producing targeted interventions to outline how their 2011 procedures will be different from 2001 in order to overcome barriers, issues and concerns identified or developed during the past ten years **2.4 Community Liaison:** engage at national and regional level both passive and active interest groups	🟢 **2.1** User need established as part of prioritisation tool and published with census question recommendations 🟢 **2.2** Guidance was provided by the Community Liaison team to the PR and Marketing teams, to the media team, to the LA Liaison teams, and to the Enumeration teams (both special and general). A series of Community panels were held in Birmingham and London to provide supplementary info to be turned into outreach plans. 🟢 **2.3** Guidance was provided by the Community Liaison team to the Target Population Working Group (TPWG) in the form of suggested texts, reasoning discussions, poster content, community-specific handbooks (called the "Getting the Count Right" leaflet - a guidance on issues, concerns and general information relating to each hard to reach or target community group individually), messages and targeted interventions. The TPWG agreed to lead on overseeing the production of these materials. 🟢

2

	Identified Issue	When identified (by whom)	Equality groups which are most likely to be affected	Sources of evidence used to assess impact	Proposed actions/ Recommendations	Actions to be taken EIIT= Ethnicity, Identity and Inequalities Team	Progress against action ● Completed ● Underway ● Not yet started ● Action falling behind – bring to attention of High Level Design Board (HLB)
							2.4 A series of meetings have taken place with a range of ethnic groups, including both belief and non-belief based groups. The meetings addressed general census issues as well as usage of the write-in space on national identity and ethnic group questions. There has also been significant engagement on specific issues which have been raised by active groups. ●

	Identified Issue	When identified (by whom)	Equality groups which are most likely to be affected	Sources of evidence used to assess impact	Proposed actions/ Recommendations	Actions to be taken EIIT= Ethnicity, Identity and Inequalities Team	Progress against action 🟢 Completed 🟠 Underway 🔵 Not yet started 🔴 Action falling behind – bring to attention of High Level Design Board (HLB)
3	**ALL:** One of the elements taken into account by ONS is the leading role it plays in framing ethnic group categories, which are then used by over 43,000 public bodies across the UK. Public bodies often use the Census ethnicity question as a model for the collection of data for ethnic monitoring. The ethnic group categories of the Census are used by these public bodies to conduct ethnic monitoring. The monitoring results are evidence of equality performance and enable public bodies to measure and improve equality outcomes for particular communities. Due to space constraints in the Census form, it is not possible to provide tick boxes for every possible ethnic group. However, information provided in 'Other' write in boxes for all ethnic groups is invaluable for planning purposes, where public bodies need to have information to plan appropriate services for people from different ethnic minority communities.	November 2007 (Diversity Solutions)	All communities, including majority and minority ethnic communities; and groups within communities.	Prioritisation tool	It is recommended that ONS agrees a policy on how to prioritise which ethnic groups will be covered by tick-boxes and which will be covered by 'Other' written-in answers.	**3.1 EIIT:** Develop prioritisation tool and use to assess possible new tick boxes <u>Winter 2007</u> **3.2 UK Census Committee:** Endorse tool <u>Spring 08</u> **3.3 EIIT:** Communicate tool and outcomes to EHRC and DiAG in <u>November 2008</u> **3.4 EIIT:** Publish tool and outcomes in <u>November 2008</u>	🟢 **3.1** Prioritisation tool developed and used by EIIT to determine tick boxes in partnership with EILR topic group and EHRC Dec 07 🟢 **3.2** Prioritisation tool and results agreed by the UKCC 15 Feb 2008 🟢 **3.3** Tool and outcomes communicated to EHRC and DiAG 🟢 **3.4** Prioritisation tool published on-line in December 2008 and updated March 2009 🟢
4	**ALL:** Lack of full Census Outputs can reinforce adverse impact experienced by communities in a variety of ways. For example, the consultation revealed that several groups who consider themselves to belong to a distinct ethnic group feel disadvantaged by the lack of a tick box in the Census. They feel that this renders them invisible compared to other ethnic groups and that the distinct cultural needs of their communities are therefore not being addressed by service planners.	November 2007 (Diversity Solutions)	All communities, including majority and minority ethnic communities; and groups within communities.	Stakeholder meetings	It is recommended that ONS liaises with representatives of ethnic groups that are not covered by tick-boxes to inform them of the policy and encourage them to make full use of the write-in boxes to ensure their community is accurately measured.	**4.1 Stakeholder Management:** Develop Community Liaison Strategy to be agreed in <u>November 2008</u> **4.2 Stakeholder Management:** Discuss policy with DiAG in <u>November 08</u>	🟢 **4.1** Completed and signed off by SMC Board November 2008, along with a yearly updated action plan 🟢 **4.2** Action completed November 2008 🟢

	Identified Issue	When identified (by whom)	Equality groups which are most likely to be affected	Sources of evidence used to assess impact	Proposed actions/ Recommendations	Actions to be taken EIIT= Ethnicity, Identity and Inequalities Team	Progress against action ● Completed ● Underway ● Not yet started ● Action falling behind – bring to attention of High Level Design Board (HLB)
5	**ALL:** The policy and Census guidance should be designed to encourage communities to use the write in boxes, giving examples of how the information will be used to their benefit in a variety of ways.	November 2007 (Diversity Solutions)	All communities, including majority and minority ethnic communities; and groups within communities.	Stakeholder meetings	ONS agrees a policy on how the written in answers will be output, including what range of outputs will be produced based on the written answers. The policy must be the subject of an equality impact assessment to enable consultation with communities that would benefit from the policy, including Kashmiri, Arab, Eastern and Central European and Cornish communities. The policy and Census guidance should be designed to encourage communities to use the write in boxes, giving examples of how the information will be used to their benefit in a variety of ways.	(these actions also relate to recommendation 20) **5.1 Census Outputs:** Consult with relevant community groups and with EILR Academic Advisory group and NSWGEI <u>Autumn 08-Autumn 09</u> **5.2 Census Outputs:** Formulate draft policy on how the written in answers will be output, including what range of outputs will be produced based on the written answers <u>Winter 09</u> **5.3 Census Outputs:** Conduct EIA on all census outputs content decisions <u>Winter 09</u> **5.4 Census Outputs:** Publish policy <u>Spring 10</u>	● **5.1** Census Outputs consultation has been launched with all Census users including community groups and academic advisory groups. Decisions on the classification and output rules for written responses have been taken following consultation with academic and interest groups. ● **5.2** The relationship between disclosure control and outputs is currently being investigated. Once a full understanding of the relationship has been reached, consideration will be given to whether standard outputs relating to small populations can be produced. ● **5.3** Consultation with users on Census outputs will take place throughout 2010. Once user requirements are clearer an EIA will be carried out. ● **5.4** Output strategy produced. Published January 2010. ●

	Identified Issue	When identified (by whom)	Equality groups which are most likely to be affected	Sources of evidence used to assess impact	Proposed actions/ Recommendations	Actions to be taken EIIT= Ethnicity, Identity and Inequalities Team	Progress against action 🟢 Completed 🟠 Underway 🔵 Not yet started 🔴 Action falling behind – bring to attention of High Level Design Board (HLB)
6	**ETHNIC GROUP:** There is evidence from the 2006-07 consultation that the colour term 'Mixed' is offensive to some people whose ancestry includes Caribbean, African or Asian and White people. The term 'Mixed Heritage' is now widely used in public bodies in response to demands for appropriate language from service users. However, question testing with members of the public carried out by the University of Kent show that many people use the term 'Mixed' to describe their ethnic identity and prefer it to other alternatives.	November 2007 (Diversity Solutions)	All communities, including majority and minority ethnic communities; and groups within communities. Specifically Mixed Race/ multiple heritage individuals	Consultation Cognitive testing Stakeholder meetings Focus groups	It is recommended that ONS investigates whether the term 'Mixed' has an adverse impact and, if so, what terms would be more appropriate.	**6.1 EIIT:** Investigate need for changing phrasing of 'Mixed' heading based on stakeholder consultation Winter 2007/8 **6.2 DCM:** Explore issue through focus groups 2007 **6.3 DCM:** Conduct cognitive testing of wording 2008 **6.4 EIIT/ Stakeholder Management:** Present new heading to stakeholders to ascertain acceptability Spring 2008	🟢 **6.1** Heading changed to 'Mixed/multiple ethnic groups' (harmonised with Scotland) and agreed by UK Census Committee Feb 2008 🟢 **6.2** Wording explored in focus groups where respondents preferred term 'Mixed Race' 🟢 **6.3** New wording tested in cognitive testing 2008 with no problems encountered 🟢 **6.4** New wording presented to DiAG, NSWGEI and EILR Academic Advisory Group Spring 2008 🟢

	Identified Issue	When identified (by whom)	Equality groups which are most likely to be affected	Sources of evidence used to assess impact	Proposed actions/ Recommendations	Actions to be taken EIIT= Ethnicity, Identity and Inequalities Team	Progress against action 🟢 Completed 🟠 Underway 🔵 Not yet started 🔴 Action falling behind – bring to attention of High Level Design Board (HLB)

7	**ETHNIC GROUP:** ONS is testing whether the 'Chinese' category should be moved from 'Other ethnic group' to 'Asian or Asian British'….
	   The reason for moving it …is because analysis of 2001 Census data showed that people of South East Asian origin…were inconsistently recorded, because some classified themselves as 'Other Asian', while others classified themselves as 'Other Ethnic Group'. This hindered the production of statistics for these groups. Recording all Asians under the same heading may provide a solution.
	   There have been no representations objecting to this change from the Chinese community or from other Asian communities. Some users were concerned that the term 'Asian' is generally understood to refer to 'South Asian', and that including Chinese would hinder comparison with 2001 and make the 'Asian' category so broad that it would become meaningless. However other users support the move. It should be noted that the 2001 Census in Scotland recorded Chinese under 'Asian'….
	   At this time, there is no evidence that moving 'Chinese' to the Asian or Asian British' category will have an adverse impact on any of the other Asian sub-groups.
		November 2007 (Diversity Solutions)	Chinese, other ethnic groups, Asian or Asian British	Cognitive testing Stakeholder meetings	It is recommended that ONS carries out more research and consultation into the optimum placement of the Chinese ethnic group category.	**7.1 EIIT:** Examine consultation user need for relocating Chinese tick box Autumn/ Winter 2007
						
						7.2 EIIT: Investigate how SE and E Asian respondents in 2001 wrote in Autumn/ Winter 2007
						
						7.3 DCM: Cognitively test question with Chinese respondents Spring/ Summer 2008
						
						7.4 EIIT and **Questionnaire Design:** Communicate decision to stakeholders Spring/ Summer 2008
							🟢
							
							7.1 EIIT examined consultation user need Winter 2007 🟢
							
							7.2 EIIT research revealed that SE and E Asian respondents wrote in inconsistently in 2001 confirming decision to relocate Chinese to Asian heading in Winter 2007 🟢
							
							7.3 DCM question cognitively tested with Chinese respondents revealing positive reactions to change 🟢
							
							7.4 EIIT and **Questionnaire Design** presented changes to DiAG, NSWGEI and EILR Academic Advisory Group Spring 2008 🟢

8	**ETHNIC GROUP:** See differential impact for 7.	November 2007 (Diversity Solutions)	Chinese, other ethnic groups, Asian or Asian British	2001 Census data 2007 test data 2008 postal test data	It is recommended that the impact of moving the Chinese ethnic group category, if made, is kept under review when the 2011 Census Outputs are available.	**8.1 EIIT:** Analyse impact of relocating Chinese tick box when results are released 2012	🔵 **8.1** Will start after Census takes place 🔵

	Identified Issue	When identified (by whom)	Equality groups which are most likely to be affected	Sources of evidence used to assess impact	Proposed actions/ Recommendations	Actions to be taken EIIT= Ethnicity, Identity and Inequalities Team	Progress against action ● Completed ● Underway ● Not yet started ● Action falling behind – bring to attention of High Level Design Board (HLB)
9	**ETHNIC GROUP:** The ONS consultations have revealed conflicting views about the acceptability of the colour term 'Black or Black British'. It is viewed as offensive to some people of African heritage, setting them apart from others, such as Asians, who are not defined in the Census by the colour of their skin. However, other people of African heritage identify with the term 'Black', which they consider to be a term of visibility that draws its meaning from the civil rights struggle of the 1960s in the USA. Today, the term African American is used in the American public sector as a term of equality that does not define people by the colour of their skin. Those who object to the colour term 'Black or Black British' prefer the geographical terminology being tested by the General Register Office for Scotland. This is considered to be a neutral approach that does not refer to skin colour.	November 2007 (Diversity Solutions)	Black groups, Black British, Black African, Black Caribbean and Black Other	Cognitive testing Omnibus survey Stakeholder meetings	It is recommended that ONS investigates the acceptability of the colour term 'Black or Black British' and any potential alternatives such as a geographical reference.	**9.1 EIIT:** Meet with relevant stakeholders from diverse perspectives investigate acceptability of the colour terminology March 2007 **9.2 Questionnaire Design & DCM:** Investigate colour terminology through cognitive testing 2007/8 **9.3 Questionnaire Design:** Investigate colour terminology through Omnibus survey 2007-8 **9.4 Questionnaire Design & DCM:** Investigate colour terminology through focus groups 2007 **9.5 EIIT:** Liaise with Scottish Government to understanding findings from their testing on this issue ongoing 2007-8 **9.6 EIIT & Questionnaire Design**: Communicate decision to stakeholders Spring/ Summer 2008 **9.7 EIIT:** Publish findings Autumn/ Winter 2008	● **9.1** Met with relevant stakeholders representing a range of perspectives March 2007 ● **9.2** Terminology explored through cognitive testing 2007-8 ● **9.3** Question asked in 3 months of omnibus survey found majority acceptance of colour terminology amongst all ethnic groups ● **9.4** Focus groups 2007 identified opinions both for and against colour terminology ● **9.5** Scottish Government evidence reveals geographical labels alone were confusing for respondents ● **9.6** Wrote to colour terminology stakeholders explaining decision to retain term Black but also introduce geographical terminology in heading July 2008 ● **9.7** Findings included in publication of recommended questions paper on ethnic group in December 2008 ●

	Identified Issue	When identified (by whom)	Equality groups which are most likely to be affected	Sources of evidence used to assess impact	Proposed actions/ Recommendations	Actions to be taken EIIT= Ethnicity, Identity and Inequalities Team	Progress against action 🟢 Completed 🟠 Underway 🔵 Not yet started 🔴 Action falling behind – bring to attention of High Level Design Board (HLB)
10	**ETHNIC GROUP:** People from different African countries living in the UK will have different experiences. These differences need to be reflected in the planning processes of public bodies. The CRE, for example, says that "there is some evidence that some African groups have different social and economic life-chances compared to other groups and a growing body of evidence on the extreme disadvantage experienced by Somalis in particular." However, the ability of public bodies to analyse these experiences is limited by the ways in which it gathers and uses ethnic monitoring data. Public bodies can expand the 'African' category when monitoring their service delivery and employment, and are encouraged by the CRE to do this. However, many use the basic Census categories for most service areas. Expanded Census categories will enhance the ability of public bodies to plan and deliver services that meet the needs of distinct ethnic groups from different regions of Africa.	November 2007 (Diversity Solutions)	Black African groups	Stakeholder meetings 2007 test data 2008 postal test data 2011 Census results 2001 data	It is recommended that ONS investigates how best to measure the diversity of African ethnic groups.	**10.1 EIIT:** Specifically investigate whether the diversity of African ethnic groups can be measured in question design as part of prioritisation exercise <u>Spring 2008</u> (see action 3.1) **10.2 EIIT:** Investigate how to capture diversity of African populations using additional analysis of 2007 Census Test and 2007 & 2008 postal tests and produce guidance on how this might be possible <u>Mid 2009</u> **10.3 Census Outputs:** Produce plan for outputs in line with action 10.2 by <u>End 2009</u>	🟠 **10.1** Meeting with relevant stakeholders from diverse perspectives held in March 2007. Analysis of feasibility/ priority of detailed African categories in ethnic group question part of tick box prioritisation process. Decision made not to sub divide African category but to use other census questions to capture diversity. 🟢 **10.2** Analysis and guidance will be incorporated into harmonisation project 🟠 **10.3** The information gathered by EIIT was incorporated into the review of the ethnic group classifications which resulted in the introduction of around 50 ethnicities. The outputs team are currently considering how to produce detailed data on ethnic group whilst ensuring that all the requirements of disclosure control are met. 🟠

	Identified Issue	When identified (by whom)	Equality groups which are most likely to be affected	Sources of evidence used to assess impact	Proposed actions/ Recommendations	Actions to be taken EIIT= Ethnicity, Identity and Inequalities Team	Progress against action ● Completed ● Underway ● Not yet started ● Action falling behind – bring to attention of High Level Design Board (HLB)
11	**NATIONAL IDENTITY:** The national identity question, if adopted for the 2011 Census, would enable public bodies to enhance their ethnic monitoring data. The country of birth question, which will be included in the 2011 Census, will also enhance ethnic monitoring data on people born in countries outside the UK, including African countries.	November 2007 (Diversity Solutions)	All communities, including majority and minority ethnic communities; and groups within communities.	n/a	It is recommended that ONS should work with the Equality and Human Rights Commission, and with other organisations carrying out equality monitoring, to advise on how to use the range of Census questions as the basis for equality monitoring beyond the 2011 Census.	**11.1 EIIT:** Discuss with EHRC about how other census questions can be used in equality monitoring <u>Mid 2009</u> **11.2 EIIT:** Publish advice <u>2010</u>	● **11.1** EHRC sit on harmonisation sub-group – the remit of group does not specifically cover equality monitoring but some general advice will be incorporated into guidance which EHRC will be involved with ● **11.2** EHRC to publish main advice on equality monitoring but ONS will signpost in main guidance ●
12	**ETHNIC GROUP:** The wording 'Gypsy/Romany/Irish Traveller' is confusing and may discourage some people from responding. Gypsies and Irish Travellers are recognised in law as two distinct ethnic groups and the wording should reflect the groups. 'Romany' refers to Gypsies who have lived in the UK for centuries. Roma Gypsies are recent arrivals from Eastern Europe. It is not known how many Roma are in the UK and the 2011 Census is an opportunity to capture this information.	November 2007 (Diversity Solutions)	All Gypsy/Irish traveller communities	Stakeholder meetings Cognitive testing	It is recommended that ONS investigate the appropriate wording for the 'Gypsy/Romany/Irish Traveller' category.	**12.1 EIIT:** Analyse 2006/7 EILR consultation responses and engage with EHRC to understand optimum wording <u>Winter 2007</u> **12.2 DCM:** Cognitively test wording with Gypsies and Irish Travellers <u>Summer 2008</u> **12.3 EIIT** & **Stakeholder management:** Communicate decision to stakeholders <u>Spring/ Summer 2008</u>	● **12.1** Category rephrased without 'Romany' to reduce confusion and tested. ● **12.2** Cognitive testing conducted with no concerns with wording identified ● **12.3** Presented wording to Gypsy and Traveller stakeholder meeting August 2008, as well as Census Advisory and Diversity Groups, and face to face meetings with Gypsy and Traveller representative organisations across the country. ●

	Identified Issue	When identified (by whom)	Equality groups which are most likely to be affected	Sources of evidence used to assess impact	Proposed actions/ Recommendations	Actions to be taken EIIT= Ethnicity, Identity and Inequalities Team	Progress against action ● Completed ● Underway ● Not yet started ● Action falling behind – bring to attention of High Level Design Board (HLB)
13	**ETHNIC GROUP:** Gypsy and Irish Traveller communities will experience adverse impact from the 2011 Census if all reasonable efforts are not made by ONS to encourage and support them to respond to the Census questions.	November 2007 (Diversity Solutions)	All Gypsy/Irish Traveller communities European Roma	Stakeholder meetings Cognitive testing	It is recommended that further consultation is undertaken with Gypsies and Irish Travellers to make sure the terms used in the 2011 Census will be acceptable to the majority so that the maximum possible returns are made by these very vulnerable and marginalised communities	See recommendation 12	● See recommendation 12

	Identified Issue	When identified (by whom)	Equality groups which are most likely to be affected	Sources of evidence used to assess impact	Proposed actions/ Recommendations	Actions to be taken EIIT= Ethnicity, Identity and Inequalities Team	Progress against action 🟢 Completed 🟠 Underway 🔵 Not yet started 🔴 Action falling behind – bring to attention of High Level Design Board (HLB)

14	**ETHNIC GROUP:** If there are differences between [UK censuses] …, this will create issues of comparability for public sector users of the data; and for organisations and communities who wish to demonstrate needs for services and differences in equality outcomes in some regions compared to others.
	    This inconsistency will limit the value of the ethnic group data that needs to be compared for ethnic groups across the UK. This could have an adverse impact on any ethnic group that was measured differently in England and Wales compared to the rest of the UK. The data would need to be re-interpreted for purposes of comparison. There is a risk that this would not happen because of resource issues. In some cases, there would be significant resource issues for trans-national data users, such as the NHS, local authorities and police services.
	    Any change to the sub-groups will have an effect on comparisons between 2011 Census Outputs and those of the 2001 Census. This could have an adverse impact on any ethnic group for which comparable data was not available.
		November 2007 (Diversity Solutions)	All communities, including majority and minority ethnic communities; and groups within communities.	n/a	It is recommended that ONS continues its work on agreeing common questions wherever possible so that comparison can take place on Census Outputs across all four countries of the UK. Any differences between the Censuses in the four countries must be explained by the Registrars General.	**14.1 EIIT:** Hold workshops with UK counterparts to harmonise questions wherever possible
						
						14.2 EIIT & **Questionnaire Design:** Meet with UK counterparts through EILR topic group on a continuous basis
						
						14.3 UK Census Committee: Jointly agree EILR questions, understanding any reasons for divergence
						
						14.4 EIIT & **Questionnaire Design:** Publish UK questions and justifications for divergence (agreed by registrar generals)
						
						14.5 Census Outputs & **Questionnaire Design:** Work with UK counterparts to harmonise outputs <u>End 2009</u>
						
						See also action 1.1 re: meetings with UK equalities bodies and statistical agencies
							🟠
							
							14.1 Harmonisation workshops took place in June 2007, November 2007 and January 2008 🟢
							
							14.2 Countries worked together through monthly EILR topic group meetings towards the objective of harmonisation in the final questionnaire recommendations 🟢
							
							14.3 Ethnic group and national identity questions agreed UKCC Feb 2008 and reasons for divergence agreed. Religion and language questions signed off in April 2008, subsequent changes agreed June 2008. Further testing on alternatives conducted in 2009 but no alterations made. 🟢
							
							14.4 Final question recommendations for England and Wales published October 2009 🟠
							
							14.5 Work continues on harmonisation of outputs across the UK. 🟠

	Identified Issue	When identified (by whom)	Equality groups which are most likely to be affected	Sources of evidence used to assess impact	Proposed actions/ Recommendations	Actions to be taken EIIT= Ethnicity, Identity and Inequalities Team	Progress against action 🟢 Completed 🟠 Underway 🔵 Not yet started 🔴 Action falling behind – bring to attention of High Level Design Board (HLB)
15	**ETHNIC GROUP:** Cornish people have responded to consultation, asking for the inclusion of a specific 'Cornish' tick box since they are a distinct ethnic group with their own language. In the 2001 Census, over 37,000 people used the write in box to say they were Cornish.	November 2007 (Diversity Solutions)	Cornish	Stakeholder meetings Census Test Postal test Extant research 2006/7 EILR consultation	It is recommended that ONS carries out more research and consultation into the measurement of 'Cornish' national identity.	**15.1 Questionnaire Design:** Conduct stakeholder meeting in Cornwall April 2007 **15.2 DCM:** Conduct cognitive testing in Cornwall by October 2007 **15.3 EIIT:** Consider case for a Cornish tick box considered (action 3.1) in light of other claims and space constraints Dec 2008 See also actions 5.1 (re: outputs) and 4 (re: stakeholder engagement)	🟢 **15.1** Stakeholder meeting held in April 2007. 🟢 **15.2** Cognitive testing completed in Wave 3 (July to September 2007) 🟢 **15.3** Case considered drawing on consultation, testing results and correspondence. The possibility of including a 'Cornish' tick-box in the ethnic group question was considered alongside a number of other groups as part of the prioritisation tool. Concluded that national identity question written responses will be best way to collect data on Cornish 🟢

Version 1.1

	Identified Issue	When identified (by whom)	Equality groups which are most likely to be affected	Sources of evidence used to assess impact	Proposed actions/ Recommendations	Actions to be taken EIIT= Ethnicity, Identity and Inequalities Team	Progress against action 🟢 Completed 🟠 Underway 🔵 Not yet started 🔴 Action falling behind – bring to attention of High Level Design Board (HLB)
16	**NATIONAL IDENTITY:** Since the introduction of devolved government in Scotland and Wales, The Welsh Assembly and Scottish Parliament are interested to understand the different national identities in their nations. In the 2001 Census, a question about country of birth was used. However, this is not the same as national identity, which is a subjective identity that can change depending on a person's circumstances, such as migration from one country to another. The likely impact on all communities of the Census 2011 question on national identity is positive if the message is understood that the purpose is to enrich ethnic group data.	November 2007 (Diversity Solutions)	All communities, including majority and minority ethnic communities; and groups within communities.	LFS	It is recommended that the reasons for asking a national identity question are made clear and unambiguous. ONS should also consider if an alternative question will produce the desired results, such as country of birth or country of citizenship.	**16.1** See also recommendation 2.1 **16.2 Questionnaire Design:** Undertake analysis of LFS data comparing national identity, country of birth and citizenship and publish <u>end 2008</u>	🟢 **16.1** Reasons for asking a national identity question explained in detail in the question recommendations paper published in Winter 2009🟢 **16.2** Completed showing that alternative sources are not suitable. Currently no intentions to publish the document. 🟢

14

	Identified Issue	When identified (by whom)	Equality groups which are most likely to be affected	Sources of evidence used to assess impact	Proposed actions/ Recommendations	Actions to be taken EIIT= Ethnicity, Identity and Inequalities Team	Progress against action 🟢 Completed 🟠 Underway 🔵 Not yet started 🔴 Action falling behind – bring to attention of High Level Design Board (HLB)
17	**LANGUAGE:** Reliable information on language use is not currently available for England and Wales. This makes it difficult for public bodies to know if the range of interpreting, translation and transcription services they provide is adequate to meet the needs of their populations, including people whose first language is not English; and those who do not read or write English, such as many people in the Deaf Community. It is a common misperception that Deaf people read and write English, even when they communicate in British Sign Language. The question would also be used to assess the literacy levels of people in different localities. The Census output data would help to improve the targeting of adult literacy campaigns.	November 2007 (Diversity Solutions)	All communities	2006/7 EILR consultation Advisory group meetings Cognitive testing Omnibus survey	It is recommended that ONS continues research and consultation into the precise requirements for language information and what questions people can reasonably answer.	**17.1 EIIT:** Analyse responses to 2006/7consultation 2007-2008 **17.2 EIIT:** Consult with the EILR Academic Advisory Group, the Census Advisory groups and NSWGEI 2007-8 **17.3 DCM:** Carry out cognitive testing of language questions 2007-8 **17.4 EIIT:** Analyse language questions using Omnibus survey modules in May and June 2008 by Autumn 2008 **17.5 Statistical Design:** Consult key users about what level of detail of language they need coding for July 2008	🟢 **17.1** Consultation responses analysed Autumn 2007- Spring 2008, identifying primary need for English proficiency and main language spoken 🟢 **17.2** All these groups have contributed to the design and requirements of the language question throughout 2008 🟢 **17.3** Testing competed – evidence available in final question recommendations -language 🟢 **17.4** Analysis complete – evidence available in final question recommendations - language publication 🟢 **17.5** Meeting held June 2008. Local Government Association agreed to follow up with local authorities to ensure list is comprehensive. RNID consulted on classification for sign languages. Further consultation held in January 2010 to finalise 2011 Census classifications. Groups consulted include the academic advisory group and the National Statistics Working Group on Ethnicity and Identity. 🟢

	Identified Issue	When identified (by whom)	Equality groups which are most likely to be affected	Sources of evidence used to assess impact	Proposed actions/ Recommendations	Actions to be taken EIIT= Ethnicity, Identity and Inequalities Team	Progress against action ● Completed ● Underway ● Not yet started ● Action falling behind – bring to attention of High Level Design Board (HLB)
18	**RELGIOUS AFFILIATION:** Since the 2001 Census, legislation has been introduced that outlaws discrimination on the grounds of religion or belief in the provision of employment, goods, facilities and services. The Employment Equality (Religion or Belief) Regulations 2003 and the Equality Act 2006 make it unlawful to discriminate against anyone on grounds of their religion or belief. The Equality Act 2006 defines religion as any religion and belief as any religious or philosophical belief. Belief systems include: • Agnosticism • Atheism • Humanism • Paganism Currently there is no accurate data that enable public bodies and others to know the numbers of people who belong to, or practice, different religions and beliefs. The 2007 Census Test religion category and sub-groups do not reflect the legislative changes that recognise belief as well as religion. ONS should consider collecting information on belief, as well as religion, in the 2011 Census. This will provide baseline data, assisting public bodies to assess the effectiveness of their anti-discrimination policies and practice in this area; and to provide services that have due regard to the range of religion and belief systems of individuals and local populations.	November 2007 (Diversity Solutions)	All communities including those holding non-religious beliefs	Cognitive testing Omnibus survey 2006/7 EILR consultation	To avoid adverse impact on people who do not have a religion but who do have a religious or philosophical belief, it is recommended that ONS investigates whether the question can be rephrased to collect information on religion and other (including non-religious) belief systems.	**18.1 EIIT:** Examine need and scope for collecting information on non-religious beliefs using 2006/7 EILR consultation 2007- 2008 **18.2 DCM:** Carry out question testing on alternative phrasing through cognitive testing 2007-8 **18.3 Questionnaire Design** & **EIIT:** Carry out question testing on alternative phrasing through Omnibus survey Sep, Nov, Dec 2007, May, June 2008	● **18.1** Completed Summer 2008. Concluded user need low and not possible to measure non religious beliefs or to make reference to belief in question without reducing data quality. ● **18.2** Alternative wording tested in cognitive testing 2007/8, identified explicit or implicit reference to belief changes respondents' understanding of question. A further alternative was tested in 2009. ● **18.3** Alternative wording tested in Omnibus modules identified explicit and implicit reference to belief significantly changed response frequencies. A further alternative was tested between April and July 2009. Evidence from all the testing is available in final question recommendations - religion ●

	Identified Issue	When identified (by whom)	Equality groups which are most likely to be affected	Sources of evidence used to assess impact	Proposed actions/ Recommendations	Actions to be taken EIIT= Ethnicity, Identity and Inequalities Team	Progress against action 🟢 Completed 🟠 Underway 🔵 Not yet started 🔴 Action falling behind – bring to attention of High Level Design Board (HLB)
19	**RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION:** Further from point 18 it is essential that respondents understand the difference between religion and belief if they are both to be asked in the question. If respondents wrongly interpret belief as belief in God, rather than a non-religious belief system, this will have an adverse impact on the way the data is interpreted.	November 2007 (Diversity Solutions)	All communities,	n/a	It is recommended that Census guidance notes explain the difference between a religion and a belief, with examples such as those given in the equality impact assessment.	See recommendation 18 – decided not to make reference to belief in affiliation question	Not needed as decided not to make reference to belief in religion question. Interim guidance on religion question published on website in November 2009. More detailed paper due Spring 2011.
20	**RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION:** The policy and Census guidance should be designed to encourage religious groups (and non-belief systems if included in the question) to use the write in boxes, giving examples of how the information will be used to their benefit in a variety of ways.	November 2007 (Diversity Solutions)	All communities	Stakeholder meetings	It has been recommended above (Recommendation 5) that ONS agrees a policy on how the written in answers will be output, including in what circumstances full outputs from Census data will be produced based on the written answers. It is recommended that ONS works with multi-faith and belief groups when deciding how this policy will apply to outputs on religion and belief.	See actions for recommendation 5	See actions for recommendation 5

	Identified Issue	When identified (by whom)	Equality groups which are most likely to be affected	Sources of evidence used to assess impact	Proposed actions/ Recommendations	Actions to be taken EIIT= Ethnicity, Identity and Inequalities Team	Progress against action 🟢 Completed 🟠 Underway 🔵 Not yet started 🔴 Action falling behind – bring to attention of High Level Design Board (HLB)
21	**RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION:** See differential impacts for 19 and 20	November 2007 (Diversity Solutions)	All communities	Stakeholder meetings	It is recommended that ONS works pro-actively with multi-faith and belief groups to determine effective ways of enabling people to understand the value of providing accurate information on their religion and belief systems.	**21.1 Stakeholder Management:** Work directly with religion and belief groups to encourage write in responses 2008-11 (also see 2.4 above) **21.2 Stakeholder Management:** Use DiAG to encourage write in responses ongoing 2008-11	🟠 **21.1** Meetings have taken place with Board of Deputies of British Jews (2007) Sikh organisations (2007) the Inter Faith Network (2007/8) and British Humanist Association (2007/8). Follow up is taking place through face to face meetings with individual groups, with specific agenda to make preparations and promote awareness for census day. By April 2010 meetings had also been held with Gurkha, Nepalese, Kashmiri, Somali and Bengali groups. Further meetings are planned in 2010. 🟠 **21.2** Ongoing – discussed regularly at DiAG 🟠
22	**ALL**	November 2007 (Diversity Solutions)	All communities	n/a	When advising on equality monitoring, it is recommended that ONS should consider ways of encouraging organisations to understand the value of gathering and using information on national identity and religion as a means of enriching ethnic group data.	**22.1 EIIT:** Work through EILR Harmonisation sub-group to produce guidance on monitoring, based on census questions in End 2009	🟠 **22.1** Started 2009. Project due for completion spring 2011 🟠

	Identified Issue	When identified (by whom)	Equality groups which are most likely to be affected	Sources of evidence used to assess impact	Proposed actions/ Recommendations	Actions to be taken EIIT= Ethnicity, Identity and Inequalities Team	Progress against action 🟢 Completed 🟠 Underway 🔵 Not yet started 🔴 Action falling behind – bring to attention of High Level Design Board (HLB)
23	**ALL**	November 2007 (Diversity Solutions)	All communities	Hold reviews to monitor the progress of the response to the EIA recommendations	ONS will keep the potential for adverse impact under review at all stages of the Census design process; and all reasonable attempts will be made to mitigate the impact. Questions on ethnicity, national identity, language and religion should be revised where necessary when the evidence-gathering is finalised and reviewed.	**23.1 Questionnaire Design:** Hold 6 monthly reviews of action plan <u>Ongoing</u> **23.2 Stakeholder management:** Discuss EILR questions with census advisory groups <u>2007-2008</u>	🟠 **23.1** Ongoing. Last updated February 2010 🟠 **23.2:** Discussed EIA with census advisory in Spring 2008 where suggestions were made for changing questions. These and earlier issues taken into account in questionnaire design process, with updates provided to advisory groups throughout. Questionnaire recommendations for the 2009 Rehearsal were published in Winter 2008. Final questionnaire recommendations for the 2011 Census were published in October 2009. 🟢

Glossary

2006/7 EILR consultation	ONS consultation on user needs for Ethnicity, National Identity, Language and Religious Affiliation questions in England and Wales. http://www.ons.gov.uk/census/2011-census/consultations/eth-group-nat-iden/index.html
Census Advisory Groups	One of the ways in which the Office for National Statistics consults with census users is through a number of Census Advisory Groups that represent the interests of the main user communities. These currently cover: • central government departments • local authorities • the health service • the business sector and professional interests • the academic community • organisations with interests in special needs and minority populations (DiAG) • users in Wales Meetings are usually held twice a year, often to time with particular developments or key events in census planning. Summaries of the topics covered in the most recent round of meetings are available to download. There are further groups managed by the General Register Office for Scotland and the Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency to cover census users in Scotland and Northern Ireland respectively. http://www.ons.gov.uk/census/2011-census/consultations/user-adv-groups/index.html
Census Outputs	ONS team responsible for developing the 2011 Census output strategy
Census Test	On 13 May 2007, ONS conducted the first major field test for the next census. The purpose of conducting the voluntary test was to assess a wide range of different aspects in planning, testing and evaluating the census operation and to feed these into the design of the 2011 Census. http://www.ons.gov.uk/census/2011-census/2011-census-project/2007-test/index.html
Cognitive Testing	The purpose of cognitive testing is to explore, understand and explain the ways in which people go about answering survey questions. This allows the researcher to ascertain whether or not a question is working as intended, and whether the information that respondents need to enable them to answer accurately is obtainable. Cognitive testing generally takes place as a one-to-one interview, although it is possible to use a focus group situation. http://www.ons.gov.uk/about/who-we-are/our-services/data-collection-methodology/services-available-from-dcm/cognitive-testing
Data Collection Methodology	ONS team responsible for assessing, optimising and implementing data collection procedures for surveys, Census and administrative sources.
DCM	See **Data Collection Methodology**
DiAG	See **Diversity Advisory Group**
Diversity Advisory	One of a number of **Census Advisory Groups** made up of organisations with

Group	interests in special needs and minority populations
Diversity Solutions	Specialist equality and diversity consultants commisioned by ONS to carry out **EILR** Equality Impact Assessment. http://www.diversity-solutions.com/
EHRC	Equality and Human Rights Commission. Independent statutory body established to help eliminate discrimination, reduce inequality, protect human rights and to build good relations, and to ensure that everyone has a fair chance to participate in society. www.equalityhumanrights.com
EILR	Ethnicity, [National] Identity, Language and Religious Affiliation questions
EILR Academic Advisory Group	Small and occasional group of academics set up to support the work of the **EILR topic group** providing independent academic perspectives on issues relating to the **EILR** topic to ensure the best possible questions, outputs and supporting guidance.
EILR Harmonisation Sub-Group	Group of representatives of government departments and selected individuals with a key interest that was be established in 2009 to review and update/ create National Statistics harmonised questions and guidance on ethnicity, national identity, language and religion. http://www.ons.gov.uk/about-statistics/harmonisation/index.html
EILR Topic Group	Established in April 2005 with the main aim of recommending ethnic group, national identity, language and religion questions for inclusion in the 2009 Census rehearsal and the 2011 Census. The interim responsibilities of this group are to determine the user requirements for information on ethnicity, national identity, language and religion and to propose suitable Census questions to address this data needs. The work of the group also includes researching other potential sources of information that could answer the user requirements in 2011 and coordinating question testing for the above topics. Representatives includes **Ethnicity, Identity and Inequalities Team**, **Questionnaire Design, Data Collection Methodology, Harmonisation, Welsh Assembly Government**, **NISRA, Scottish Government and GROS**

Ethnicity, Identity and Inequalities Team (EIIT)	ONS team responsible for (amongst other things) making recommendations on the Ethnicity, National Identity, Language and Religion questions for the 2011 Census
General Register Office of Scotland (GROS)	Part of the devolved Scottish Administration. Responsible for Scotland's 2011 Census. http://www.gro-scotland.gov.uk/
High Level Design Board	The High Level Design Board is responsible for the following activities: • ownership of the end to end statistical design and management of any proposed changes to the overall design • resolution of any cross cutting strategic issues including for example issues relating to questionnaire design • controlling medium / high level changes to the programme including resolution of requests for change that impact on more than one project • management of proposed changes to programme budget including control of change control budget management of issues raised by external bodies, such as Advisory Groups, Local Authorities and Users of Census Outputs
LFS	Labour Force Survey. A quarterly sample survey of households living at private addresses in Great Britain. Its purpose is to provide information on the UK labour market that can then be used to develop, manage, evaluate and report on labour market policies. http://www.statistics.gov.uk/StatBase/Source.asp?vlnk=358
National Statistics Working Group on Ethnicity and Identity (NSWGEI)	This group aims to act as a focus for work on ethnic group, identity and religion statistics requiring a cross departmental approach. Membership includes government departments and devolved administrations.
NISRA	Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency. The principal source of official information on Northern Ireland´s population and socio-economic conditions. Responsible for the 2011 Northern Ireland Census. http://www.nisra.gov.uk/
Opinions Survey (Omnibus)	A multi-purpose survey carried out by ONS based on interviews with a sample of about 1,800 adults per survey month, with one adult selected from each household. The Survey is a vehicle providing quick results from relatively short and simple sets of questions. Questions on particular topics can be added for one month or for longer if required. http://www.statistics.gov.uk/STATBASE/Source.asp?vlnk=657
ONS	The Office for National Statistics produces independent information to improve understanding of the United Kingdom's economy and society. Responsible for the 2011 England and Wales census. http://www.ons.gov.uk
Questionnaire Design	ONS team responsible for overall design of Census 2011 questionnaire.
Registrars General	Heads of **ONS, GROS** and **NISRA**

RNID	The Royal National Institute for Deaf People - charity representing deaf and hard of hearing people in the UK. http://www.rnid.org.uk/
Scottish Government	The devolved Government for Scotland is responsible for most of the issues of day-to-day concern to the people of Scotland including ethnic group and national identity classifications used in surveys. http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Home
Stakeholder management	ONS team responsible for engagement with stakeholders throughout Census programme.
Statistical Design	ONS team responsible for Census coding
UK Census Committee (UKCC)	This group consists of the Registrars General for England and Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland and their representatives. The purpose of the group is to agree the scope for common strategic activity across the three UK Census Offices designed to establish a common UK Census in 2011. The aim of the group is to achieve coherent UK-wide outputs from 2011 Census.
Welsh Assembly Government (WAG)	The Welsh Assembly Government is responsible for most of the issues of day-to-day concern to the people of Wales, including the economy, health, education, and local government. http://new.wales.gov.uk/?lang=en