Statistics

- **Managers**
  - Total LEIs: 16,181 (+6.24 %)
  - Active entities managed: 16,129 (+6.23 %)
  - Inactive entities managed: 52 (+8.33 %)
- **Quality Maturity Level**
  - Jan: 1.99
  - Dec: 1.99
  - Nov: 1.99
- **Coverage**
  - Covered countries: 1
- **New Lapsed LEIs**
  - Values: 27 (+38.63 %)
- **Duplicates**
  - Total LEIs marked as duplicate**: 1,951 (+7.61 %)
  - Duplicates: 16,133 (+6.27 %)
- **Values**
  - Levels 2 Info
    - LEIs with LEI parent relationships: 1,951 (+7.61 %)
    - LEIs with complete parent information: 16,133 (+6.27 %)
- **Challenges**
  - Challenges this month: 2 (+100.00 %)
  - Duplicates found this month: 0 (+/-0 %)
  - Updates to entity information this month: 0 (+/-0 %)
- **Files**
  - No. of days per month with CDF-compliant file uploads: 31 / 31 (+/-0 %)

DISCLAIMER: All figures of this LEI Data Quality Report are derived from these sources: 1) Global Legal Entity Identifier Foundation (GLEIF) Concatenated end-of-month files for all months mentioned in this report and 2) the Data Quality Reports for the reported month based on the LEI Data Quality Check Specification v2.1.3. While every care has been taken in the compilation of this information, GLEIF will not be held responsible for any loss, damage or inconvenience caused as a result of inaccuracy or error within the LEI Data Quality Report. The text and graphic content of the LEI Data Quality Report may be used, printed and distributed ONLY with the copyright information displayed (© Copyright Global Legal Entity Identifier Foundation (GLEIF)).

**Data Quality Scores**

- **LEI Issuer Total Data Quality Score**
  - The LEI Issuer Total Data Quality Score is calculated as the equal weighted average of the 11 "Data Quality Criteria".

- **LEI Issuer Data Quality ( ) against LEI Pool Average ( )**
  - 99 %

- **Data Quality in Covered Countries**
  - 100%

**Quality Maturity Level**

- Jan: 1.99
- Dec: 1.99
- Nov: 1.99

**Data Quality Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Quality Criteria</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th># Checks</th>
<th># Failed Records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 (0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0 (0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completeness</td>
<td>99.98 %</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5 (0.03 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensiveness</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 (0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>99.98 %</td>
<td>99.97 %</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62 (0.38 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currency</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 (0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0 (0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 (0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 (0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0 (0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0 (0 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Top 5 Failing Checks**

- C000291
  - # Failed Records: 61
  - Check description: If the ultimate parent is public. The ultimate par...
- C000243
  - # Failed Records: 5
  - Check description: This LEI must not have any parent RR record in R...
- C000262
  - # Failed Records: 1
  - Check description: Relationships’ NextRenewalDate (date portion) is...
- N/A
  - # Failed Records: N/A
  - Check description: N/A
- N/A
  - # Failed Records: N/A
  - Check description: N/A

The Data Quality criteria is expected to contain 12 dimensions. Currently a subset of 11 criteria is implemented, to the detriment of the score, as they are averaged on all of them. This is expected to change, on a nonfixed timeline, to include all 12 dimensions.