

Budapest, September 21, 2009

Contact person: Katalin Szép  
katalin.szep@ksh.hu

## **Comments of HCSO on National Quality Assurance Framework**

### **Prepared by Statistics Canada**

We totally agree with the introduction and interpretation of terms in terminology, however developing/accepting standard definitions on core terms should be desirable. Preferably these definitions and the quality-related definitions of international standard SDMX will be consistent.

In the paper the term “national quality assurance framework” is substituted by “national quality assessment framework” twice on the first page. We suggest using the former with the acronym NQAF.

The overview of the current quality concepts, frameworks and tools is a valuable summary, however the references are made only on sources available in English. This restriction should be mentioned or the scope widened. The countries’ papers or reports asked by Paul Cheung would provide a basis for this widening.

The description of the scope of a National Quality Assurance Framework (para 36., 37. page 12-13) needs further clarification:

It is not clear what is meant by institutional environment here. Generally it covers the whole organization, sometimes even relations to suppliers and users. In our understanding the scope of NQAF – in line with the para N38 – covers user needs, statistical products, production processes and from supporting processes only IT, making integral part of statistical production processes. We suggest excluding institutional environment, as organization, HR, and others are not handled in this framework.

Eurostat’s Guidelines for Implementation of QAFs for International Organizations Compiling Statistics is referred in para 40. page 15, so we suggest to put it in the list of references too.

We agree with the NQAF template as a less ambitious target as written in para 41. page 15. But in addition we suggest putting together a handbook as well. This handbook – somehow similar to DatQAM – should contain good practices and suggestion on development related to the elements of the template. This handbook could support countries developing their system, providing guide, and experiences of other countries.

We agree with the Template, with the points listed in Figure 2, under the title “Generic National Quality Assurance Framework”, with some exception in part 4. (page 18.).

We think 4. Quality Assessment/Program Review

- should start with setting Quality targets, and then
- continue with quality measures covering quality reports and indicators, and
- the quality assessment program should contain audits too.

Our proposal on a revised item 4. is the following:

#### **4. Quality Assessment/ Program Review**

- Quality targets – setting and monitoring.
- Quality measures – quality reports, quality indicators – defining, collecting, analysing, synthesizing – composite indicators, quality barometer/dashboard.
- Quality assessment program – self-assessment, audit, peer review, labeling/certification