

Appendix E1

NASS Comments

Appendix E1: Comments from NASS

WIC Nutrition Services and Administration Costs Study (WIC NSA)

October 30, 2013

Review Conducted by Andrew Dau at NASS Methods Branch

General Comments:

This docket is well described and documented. Its direct impact on efficient government will be very beneficial in our current budget situation.

Part A. Justification:

Part 1.

Well done. This section does a good job of discussing a solid reason why this research should be conducted.

Part 2.

It looks like this survey will not prove to be a giant burden on any WIC State or Local agency and you have done a good job of gathering extent data to support your cause.

Item #4 under "Study Design Overview" – SNAP and TANF are introduced as acronyms for the first time in the document here. I would recommend fleshing out the acronym for the reader here.

"Use of Information" – "The financial data gathered from the Web surveys will *be added....*"

Bullet #4 under Case Studies – Explain the acronym ITOs.

Part 3.

Good. You have done a solid job of gathering extent data to reduce burden.

3rd bullet point – "...checks on information provided. To ensure..."

Part 4.

Good.

Part 5.

Good.

Part 6.

It sounds like the data from 2000 is definitely out of date. Good job of highlighting changes to the program that makes it clear new data is necessary.

Part 7.

N/A

Part 8.

Good.

Part 9.

N/A

Part 10.

You might want to highlight some of the web security here since it is primarily a web based survey.

Part 11.

Good.

Part 12.

Good.

Part 13.

N/A

Part 14.

Good.

Part 15.

Good

Part 16.

Good.

Part 17.

Good.

Part 18.

Good

Part B: Collections of Information Employing Statistical Methods

Part 1.

Overall, I think the methodology described in part B is well done. First, the 80% response rate seems relatively attainable, considering this is an intra-agency survey and endorsed by FNS. The plan for a non-response bias study is a good idea. I think with the amount of extent data you have, stratification by like characteristics should be something relatively easy to accomplish. Table B1-1 does a great job outlining your sampling procedure for all of your components in this study.

Part 2.

In conjunction with the non-response bias study in part B.1., your methods should be acceptable.

Part 3.

I think the best idea here is having a working help desk to answer questions. Anytime you contact as many respondents as you are contacting, you will stir up questions that are outside the scope of instructions on the questionnaire.

Part 4.

Good work pre-testing. I see a variety of states were pre-tested.

Part 5.

Good.