Data Purchase and Access Working Group meeting
April 4, 2017
1:30 – 3pm Eastern time
https://cdp.adobeconnect.com/theboardroom
Teleconference number: 1-888-271-3643

AGENDA

1. Census Priority List
2. 2017-2018 Schedule B / Data budget
3. 211 Data and the CDP
4. Housing and Family Data in the Target Group Profiles
5. Community Poverty Project tables
6. Other business
7. Next meeting

PARTICIPANTS

Amanda Richards (Peel Region)

Amandine Martel (Northern Ontario)

Charles Burchill (Winnipeg)

Cheryl Hitchen (Kingston)

Christina Maes Nino (Winnipeg)

Harvey Low (Toronto)

Heath Priston (Toronto)

Jasmine Ing (Calgary)

Julie Lam (CDP)

Louisa Wong (Hamilton)

Michael Ditor (CDP)

Sian Jones (Calgary)

Ted Hildebrandt (Halton Region)

ACTIONS
- Need specific feedback on priority list from DPAWG members.
- CDP team will send a clean table with products identified as high priority and the group can suggest removals/change ranks.
- Come out with first run of definitions for Target Groups to be able to include housing and family data in the tables. Invite the DPAWG to approve/edit/discuss definitions.

NOTES

1. Census Priority List
   - The file has been updated – 2011 and 2006 census products were linked. We will link all the catalogue entries this summer. So that people can find all the entries for other years.
   - Have expected delivery dates added.
   - Estimated prices, some based on actual prices and some based on Brendan Rahman's estimates from 3 years ago. These prices seem reasonable.
   - Also listed are batches for purchase orders. For now, batch 1 is for 2017-18 orders and batch 2 is for 2018-19 orders.

Cheryl: Does the estimated delivery date include custom geos or only regular geos?
Michael: These are for regular geographies.
.
2. 2017-2018 Schedule B / Data budget
   - We are allotting around $130k in acquisition for the next program year. Looking at everything in the draft Schedule B that we could buy, the number is in the high $200k. This list has to be cut it down quite a bit.
   - The preliminary Schedule B and budget will be discussed at the annual meeting. Feedback before the annual meeting is welcome.
   - The numbers can change depending on revenue (consortium and membership fees).
   - The easiest way to cut down this list is to defer purchase of custom geographies into the next year. The geocoding should be done this summer. We tend to get these tables late into the new program year, so perhaps we can push it to the following year.
   - We understand that custom geographies are of high interest. According to downloads, they rank lower than standard tables that everyone can use.
   - Target group profiles rank high, so definitely will be one of our priorities.

Jasmine: Hi Michael, I just wanted to note that I noticed a couple of tables I used as examples in the intro workshops have a high number of downloads. There is the possibility that many/most of these downloads were driven by the workshops and not by actual use.
Michael: Good point! This will be taken into consideration.
Charles: Problem with not getting custom geos is that it is not available anywhere else. The same goes for the target group profiles.
Michael: We do want to make them a priority, but we need to find a way to make it work with the budget.

   - Equifax tables are very expensive, we were considering not purchasing credit risk and bankruptcy risk scores, but keeping mortgage debt and non-mortgage consumer debt.
   - Geocoding for the census is something we need to do this year. The price is fortunately lower than expected.
   - Custom tabulations (batch 1) is included in the "cross tabs" tab, as well as target group profiles.
   - The goal is to sort out priorities while staying within the budget. We want to prepare for our next batch of orders. We want to give the tools and information to the group to help set and sort the priorities. There may be some pushback, but if we know what needs to be cut or what should stay, that would be great!

Cheryl: So, is the exercise to be done, is to figure out what custom geo levels we don't want? So that we are not wasting money on tables that no one is using? And to free up money for other tables?

Michael: We don't have any tables specifically earmarked for custom geo except for the profile, which is the most popular. The next best choice is to get TGP at custom geo, as we have done previous years.

- With the first batch of tables, including standard, custom, CPP, TGP and some other requests, we are only getting an estimated 50 tables.
- One exercise that is suggested for this group is to look at the high-ticket items planned for this program year and suggest which ones could be deferred.
- One suggestion is to defer the custom Taxfiler tabulations, leaving a 2-year gap in the data.
- Considering getting fewer Envision licenses. Use was low last year, but increased this year. Perhaps can cut back by one more seat (currently we have four).
- Another suggestion is to defer the working poverty or income inequality tables and have a data gap of one year.
- Recently got CSD level for Taxfiler tables. There is interest in these tables, this would be good to hold on to.

Sian: Custom income products such as working poverty, we are interested in what is released in September first, to get an idea what will given for free. We are unclear with the potentials due to the changes in income data collection. Can we get this from the Census?

Michael: That would be a custom cross-tabulation, starting at standard geographies. Please suggest some tables.

Cheryl: It would be helpful through email to have a discussion on Taxfiler priorities. Now that census income data is coming from Taxfiler data for the census year, we want to remove duplication. Perhaps we do not need as much standard purchases. Also, we need to consider the difference in population between the two. It's hard to know until the releases.

Amanda: Just a note, Taxfiler income data is preferred by Peel members. This data comes out annually whereas the census comes out every 5 years.

Jasmine: One thing I'd like to add to the Census/Taxfiler income discussion: some of the shying away from census may have been due to the poor quality of the NHS. The data quality in 2016 income should be much better than in the last cycle, which may increase its usefulness.

- A note on geocoding – found out that Taxfiler geocoding will not be as difficult/expensive as geocoding census, although there may be the additional cost of additional testing for these tables. Suggest deferring payment for Taxfiler geocoding to next year, as well as the purchase of any taxfiler tables at custom geos.

ACTION: Need more specific feedback on priority list, otherwise we rely on download count. CDP team will send list with products identified as high/low priority and the group can suggest removals/change ranks.

3. 211 Ontario Data and the CDP
   - Received a call because the CDP can be a potential platform for distributing 211 Data. Spoke with a coordinator about a potential partnership. Next discussion will need to ask – are we funding the production and distribution of data? Do they just want to use the site and platform?

Can/should we allow access to non-members? An open-data platform seems more suitable to the distribution of this data, but the CDP is not an open data portal.

Harvey: Are they offering the data for free? Or have they talked about which data (like the call centre data) or more specifics like that?

Michael: Not yet – they couldn't provide an answer at this point. The call centre data and met-needs/un-met needs.

Harvey: Had multiple meetings with 211, about how we want to take the data and enhance it for the Toronto community. It's a directory of social services and call centre data. Toronto has been using it for 20 years now. They have been trying to make the data accessible to municipalities. For example, Region of York will be getting a cut soon. We use the data for service gap analysis, know what is out there in terms of social services sector. They have codification systems, which is standard across Canada and US. Hoping to talk to Peel, Halton and Durham – want a coding system that isn't taxonomy, but more aligned with planners. If talking about 211 Data, happy to share what we do with the data, such as geocoding and GIS.

Cheryl: My understanding is that the agency database is accessible to all municipalities. We in Kingston have the back data for a while now. Heard about dashboard for open data format. The only issue is the difference in representation – 211 is used more extensively in Toronto compared to other places.

Harvey: There is an issue with raw data, it is a separate negotiation. There are some limitations of coverage. There are notes about quality and use. Other things to think about are confidentiality and geographies.

Charles: Does 211 data go outside of Ontario? MB only came online recently.

Harvey: Yes, it does, but coverage and data may vary province to province.

Jasmine: I do think that facilitating access to 211 data would be valuable, even if it is theoretically available to folks who ask for it directly. I think there is a lot a value with the CDP providing access to products that require special request. For example, we have gained access to the PUMF files for some StatCan datasets and it is very nice to not have to contact StatCan directly and sign an agreement for each dataset we want. Sometimes its hard to even know that a product exists/is available and having the products posted on CDP helps raise that awareness and remove some barriers for access.

Harvey: Definitely have a conversation with your provincial 211!

4. Housing and Family Data in the Target Group Profiles
   - This discussion can be carried through email. Starting with TGP, indicate possible definitions for creating a family target group or a household target group. Then let members of the group pick the best definition.
   - Recall, target group profiles are populated from universe of individuals, but there's no housing or family information. For example, we need a definition of what exactly constitutes an aboriginal household?
   - We don't have to order until end of November, so we do have some time, but it's best to get definitions ready and sending it to Statistics Canada.

Heath: The context may be different depending on the target group profile. It may be that we are interested in select things like activity limitations and ages beyond 55+, 85+.

ACTION: List out the profiles, come out with first run of definitions, and then have group give feedback.

5. Community Poverty Project tables
   - Similar situation to the Target Group Profiles, not much to add since the last meeting. For now, we will go forward with the tables as previously defined. Small changes such as year of arrival for immigrants.
   - Jasmine has indicated some ideas for changes, we can continue this discussion separately.

Heath: We have roped together a group to go through these tables, will have framing document ready for the group. We can provide some thoughts on this and the target group profiles.

6. Other business
   - No other news.

7. Next meeting
   - A month and half away from annual face-to-face meeting. It will count as a meeting for this group, with lots of talk about data acquisition.
   - We can schedule another DPAWG meeting 2 months after the annual meeting, perhaps June or July. Will grab a few dates at end of July and make a doodle poll.

MEETING ENDED.