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**Overview of the Data Checking Process**

We performed data checking to ensure the accuracy of database records for the Kitsilano study site. We selected the Kitsilano study site for data checking because:

 a) the Steveston study site uses the same records in the New West registry as the Maple Ridge study site, and since both title searchers are experienced with the New West registry and performed data checking in the Maple Ridge area, the Steveston titles are assumed to be reasonably accurate;

 b) the Salt Spring Island study site requires title searching at the Victoria LTO, which requires relocation and a more extensive time commitment; and

 c) Anna is completing her work with Landscapes of Injustice and will be unavailable for data checking. If there is a need and time allows, it is still possible for Mikayla to data check the Steveston titles that Anna has searched after she is gone.

In order to avoid the over-exaggeration of inconsistencies created by checking individual titles (as was the case for Maple Ridge in summer 2016), we decided that Anna would search one or more properties across the entire chain of titles. This would more precisely show the accuracy of data entry.

As of June 19, 2017, Mikayla has searched 10 Kitsilano properties for the entire time frame. She randomly selected 2 properties (20% of the total completed number) and gave the title numbers to Anna to search. Anna searched Lot 8 of Block 229 for 12 titles and Lot 33 of Block 2 for 8 titles, and entered this data in the test database.

Because we were interested in checking for consistency in our searching methods, we decided to omit the extra properties outside the 2 selected JCOP. Searching the JCOPs would compare our methods without needlessly adding titles or complicating the process.

**Results**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Field | Percentage Correct | Explanation |
| Traces | 100% |  |
| Dates | 95% | One error in the test db (human error). |
| Transfer date | 100% |  |
| Properties | 95% | Discrepancy between test and live db (test db made property entries for extraneous properties not within the study area, live db only included those properties in the notes field). |
| Owners | 85% | All owner names correct. 15% of titles had inconsistencies related to owner addresses. |
| Consideration | 95% | One error in the live db (wrong value taken from a transfer document with Vendor’s Agreement for Sale where there are multiple values listed). |
| Market value | 40% | Prior to June 2017, title searcher was not getting market value from the Application document. Going forward, market value is being added to the live database. |
| Sellers | 65% | All owner names correct. 35% of titles had inconsistencies related to owner addresses. |
| Lawyers | 35% | Inconsistencies relating to entry of individual lawyer/agent name vs. institution name due to not using applications page in live db initially. Also inconsistent inclusion of “barristers & solicitors” in the institution name field vs. occupation. |

**Inconsistencies and Issues**

**Application Pages, Lawyers, and Market Value**

For the Vancouver registry, the transfer reel contains an application form and an indenture document for most titles. During early title searching, Mikayla was unaware of the application page which contains a lawyer/agent name and a market value. Since June 2017, she has been entering information from the application page. As a result, some titles in the live database do not have a market value or certain lawyer information, but the test database has this information. Going forward, the market value and lawyer/agent information will be gathered from the application page.

**Lawyer Names**

There was some inconsistency with lawyer entries since they can either list a lawyer name, an institution name, or both. In most cases, differences came from not using the applications page (see above). The live database often did not include lawyer names from the applications page, only lawyer information from the transfer document, so sometimes there were only institution names and not agent names.

There were also differences in the entry of institution names in cases where the institution was listed as “barristers & solicitors” or “barristers, etc.” In the live database, “barristers & solicitors” or “barristers, etc.” were entered as the occupation. In the test database, it was included in the institution name (eg, “Lando, Milsom & Frydenlund, Barristers & Solicitors”).

**Addresses**

In the live database, for addresses where the Street, Ave, etc was known but not mentioned, it was added to the entry (ie. West Broadway was entered as “Broadway St W”).

In the test database, the address was inputted exactly as shown (ie. West Broadway was entered as “Broadway W” and West Broadway Street was entered as “Broadway St W”)

**“Care Of” Protocol**

In the live database, the c/o status was put in the notes only. In the test database, the c/o status was put in the notes and the address information was entered into the fields. This was an error in the test database, since title searcher protocol dictates that c/o status should only be put in the notes.

**Transactions where the Property was Vested in the Custodian**

In the live database, JC owners were linked to the title as sellers when the property was vested in the Custodian. The rationale was that the letter included in lieu of transfer documents mentions the JC individual(s), even though they were not technically selling. Linking the JC individual(s) in as sellers gives the title searcher somewhere to input any information about the JC individual(s) (eg. Police registration numbers) givecn on the letters.

In the test database, JC owners were not linked to the title as sellers when the property was vested in the Custodian. The rationale was that the JC owners were not selling the property and do not appear as sellers on an indenture document. JC owners names were generally not included in the notes field either, since following the title thread backwards would reveal the JC owner information. (Note: the same transfer letter – sent from the Assistant Deputy Custodian to the Registrar – was used during the seizure of property in Steveston and Salt Spring, and Anna did not link JC owners as sellers in these cases, either.)

**Human Errors**

We identified some inconsistencies that were the result of title searcher error, specifically:

* A date incorrectly entered in the test database (360438L)
* A consideration value incorrectly entered in the live database, due to a complicated Right to Purchase case (360439L). This has been corrected in the live database.
* One of two sellers not entered into the live database, due to hard-to-read handwriting on transfer (98772I)