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## Work Stream 3 – Data and IDI

### Purpose of the report

1. The purpose of this report is to get agreement as to both the attached report, sign off on the aims/purpose of the workstream and agreement on the next steps

### Aims/Purpose

1. The aims/purpose of the data and IDI workstream is to enable, mediate and advocate for:
   1. Improved quality and utility/usability of disability data
   2. Improved prioritisation of disability data (i.e. for outcomes framework)
   3. Increased incorporation of disability datasets within the IDI
   4. More frequent and timely updates of disability data onto IDI
   5. More transparency and understanding of the complexities (including limitations) of disability data across the system
   6. Using best practice for identifying disabled people within IDI

### Work completed to date

1. Agreement on the aims/purpose of workstream
2. Brief discussion into examples of best practice on the use of disability data and IDI
3. Feedback on the draft disability outcomes framework, including (1) suggestions of additional potential data sources needed to be included (2) identification of limitations, (3)other nuances regarding the methodology of data collection and (4) criteria for consideration when prioritising data sources
   1. Examples of new data sources not currently included such as pharmaceutical use, no. of complaints to HRC, fraud and cybercrime rates were discussed
   2. The group mentioned disability data sources that are already included in the IDI such as life expectancy, GSS data and NZCVS data
   3. There was dialogue on the status of existing surveys such as Time use Survey – which is currently being revisited, with no funding allocation
   4. There was consideration into potential criteria for prioritisation including, but not limited to:
      1. Frequency of data collection e.g. The NZ disability survey data may not a suitable data source as not gathered frequently enough (but may still be good to have this all mapped out to capture surveys that should be undertaken more frequently)
      2. Sample sizes (if low then may not be robust)
      3. Other feasibility concerns
4. Discussion on key agencies that could be potential allies for progressing work on data and IDI (e.g. ACC)

### Next steps

1. Meet with DDEWG to sign off on agreed aims/purpose.
2. Meet with agencies with expertise on IDI and existing metadata such as SAID – the Strategic Advisory Group for Integrated Data. This will allow us to present the outcomes framework as a ‘litmus test’ to understand what the extent of disability data we can capture from the IDI. SAID can also provide expert advice on the usability of the data (e.g. using disability service data over disability status data).
3. Progress with the development of the outcomes framework, including with prioritisation of key indicators and focus and identification on areas of data that require improvements in quality and usability.