

2009 Census Rehearsal Evaluation Print

January 2010

Table of contents

| | |
|--|---|
| 1. Definition and scope for rehearsal..... | 4 |
| 2. Evaluation findings | 5 |

2009 Rehearsal – Print

1. Definition and scope for rehearsal

Print services comprises the specification, design and printing of all printed products for the 2009 rehearsal. Print products include census questionnaires, other public facing documents and other print products designed to assist some 140 census field staff carry out the enumeration process (such as instruction manuals, training notes and enumeration record books).

For the rehearsal, there were 74 printed products (referenced in the Print Product List at the end of this evaluation report).

What was tested:

- address file format and transfer;
- artwork design file format and transfer;
- print proofing process;
- print production process;
- mail merge process; and
- logistics labelling and manifests.

What could not be tested

1) Inclusion of 2D barcode in sortation solution for questionnaire return process.

General Register Office for Scotland (GROS) will revisit this requirement and review a number of solution options. It is intended that the solution selected will be tested before designs for the 2011 Census return envelopes are finalised.

2) Logistics Service Provider (LSP) labelling solution. A different LSP labelling solution was used in the 2009 rehearsal.

The original labelling solution for the 2009 rehearsal was found not to be appropriate but the work around proved successful. Further review of a suitable solution is in progress.

2. Evaluation findings

- Pre – determined evaluation points

| Description | Success Criteria | Outcome | Recommendation | Timeframe |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Design specification and Print Quality Management Plan (PQMP) | How well did the design and specification stage meet the authorities' expectations as defined in the contract. | <p>a) Some initial problems in the design stage due to difficulties in Integrated Project Team (IPT) management. Also lack of resource in GROS print team.</p> <p>b) The print product list was not formally base lined and continued to change.</p> | <p>a) Continue with the current IPT structure.</p> <p>b) Print product list to be agreed and formally base lined before the Print IPT begins in September.</p> | Before scheduled Print IPT meetings begin in September 2009. |
| Proof approval process | All proofing stages undertaken and completed within planned time scale. | <p>a) Due to lack of time caused by late sign off of questionnaire design, 'wet' proofing stage was removed from the print schedule to bring print production timetable back into line.</p> | <p>a) Ensure that all stakeholders sign up to the print schedule.</p> | Print schedule to be signed off in Autumn 2009 |

| Description | Success Criteria | Outcome | Recommendation | Timeframe |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | b) The shortened proofing process resulted in errors in finished print products. | b) Ensure the 'wet' proofing stage is incorporated into the print schedule. | |
| Print production including Personalisation | All print products are 100% accurate to the PQMP. | Quality Assurance (QA) of print production was carried out by the print contractor's quality manager and via spot checks by authority staff. Some issues were still identified in the field. | Revise the QA process as defined in PQMP to increase the spot check on key products at the site and where manual print contractor intervention is required. | Carried out by Print IPT and Quality IPT by the end of 2009. |
| Mail merge | Mail merge performance standard is 99.9 per cent accurate to the PQMP. | No issues identified or reported with mail merge of household questionnaires. Minor issues with Communal Establishment (CE) packages identified during spot checks. | Continue with mail merge process as designed but recommend that print contractor increases QA of CE packaging process and increase of spot checks on CE packages. Revisit the ability to carry out 99.9 per cent process. | Print IPT and Quality IPT are involved and should be carried out by the end of 2009. |
| Method of local sortation by Enumeration District (ED) for field | PQMP sets sort order process performance standard as 99.95 per cent. | No Issues identified with sort order of household questionnaire packages. | Continue with sort order specification as it is currently defined. | Sort order is defined in address file at Census District (CD) and ED planning stage. |

| Description | Success Criteria | Outcome | Recommendation | Timeframe |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|
| | | Reports from field provide assurance. | | |
| Dispatch of materials | All materials delivered correctly and Service Level Agreements (SLA's) met. | No reports of any issues with questionnaire deliveries. Reports of minor differences from expected volumes for some non questionnaire material. | It would be beneficial to the picking and packing solution if quantities of non-personalised products are banded. | A request for change will be raised before the end of 2009. |