

Household Surveys 2011 Redesign Project Board

MINUTES

Date & Time	Thursday 1 March 2012, 2:00pm - 3:00pm
Location	4A 103 MCPHEE (CO) 32 5618; 10L 151 TORRENS (SA) 38 7435; WA Visitors Room (WA) 38 5273
Chairperson	[REDACTED]
Minutes	[REDACTED]
Invitees	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Attendees	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Apologies	[REDACTED]
cc.	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Meeting Agenda: [REDACTED]

Key points from meeting

	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	
4	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	
Key Issues for this meeting		
5	<p>MPS Sample Design Report Notes Link</p> <p>[REDACTED] [REDACTED] The Board considered issues 2, 3 and 4, before returning to the broader issue 1.</p> <p><u>Issue #2) Does the Board feel that the EPS constraint should be relaxed, noting the trade off of cost savings against likely increases in sampling error for other estimates?</u></p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>ACTION ITEM: HSM to provide analysis of projected RSEs for other data items (such as MPHS variables and the Indigenous sub-population) to ensure no cataclysmic impact to estimate quality, and circulate</p>

[REDACTED]

results to the Board out of session.

#2 Board Position: Due to the minimal financial savings, and the potential quality implications of relaxing the constraint, the Board agreed to retain the EPS constraint.

Issue #3) Does the Board have any concerns over the slight reduction in overall sample which comes as a result of how the state accuracy targets have been set?

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

#3 Board Position: The Board ratified the sample reduction, subject to no cataclysmic impacts on quality of key data items collected in Supps or MPHS.

Issue #4) Does the Board have any concerns over the increase required to the NT sample?

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

	<p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>#4 Board Position: Board agrees to proposed NT sample increase.</p> <p><u>Issue #1) Does the Board have any comments on the approach taken to the sample design?</u></p> <p>#1 Board Position: The Board had no further comments to add.</p>	
6	<p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p>	
	<p>[Redacted text]</p>	
7	<p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p> <p>[Redacted text]</p>	

8	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	
---	---	--

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

			<p>[REDACTED]</p>
--	--	--	-------------------