

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT NATIONAL INDICATOR SET TECHNICAL HANDBOOK - RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION DOCUMENT**

**Name and address of responding organisation:**

**Devon County Council  
County Hall  
Topsham Road  
Exeter  
EX2 4QR**

**Is this your organisation's official response to the consultation? Y/N**

**Name and phone number of key contact in case of follow-up queries:**

**Louise Taylor - 01392 383478**

**National Indicator Number:**

**NI129**

*Please complete a separate form for each indicator on which you wish to respond*

<b>Indicator Issue</b>	
<b>1. Is the Technical Definition of this indicator clear?</b>	<b>Yes</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
If NO a. What aspects of the technical definition of the indicator are unclear? Please specify clearly - is it in relation to the measurement method, or - on reporting b. Please suggest how the template can be clarified/improved.	
<b>2. Does the Technical Definition for this indicator have any unintended consequences?</b>	<b>Yes</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
If YES a. What are the unintended consequences on this national indicator? b. Can the unintended consequence be avoided? If so, how?	<b>This does not measure people's choice to die at home in any way nor is it a reasonable proxy for that information. This is simply measuring what proportion do actually die at home - open to a very</b>

	<p>unwelcome accusation of a perverse incentive of reducing the ambulance response rate to give them more time. Clearly the option of measuring choice by survey of the people after the event is out of the question another method to measure choice is required. The proposed approach is really not an option. Obviously more time is required to produce a useful indicator so introduction of this one will need to be delayed to allow for this development. One area to look at should be the amount of already reported data that would enable people to be identified that have died from recognised terminal illnesses where they could be expected to have been able to exercise a choice of where to die and use this subset for both numerator and denominator.</p>
<p><b>3. Will the Technical Definitions for this indicator work in practice?</b></p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/>                      No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>If NO a. Why would this technical definition not work in practice?</p>	
<p><b>4. Is this indicator defined at the right spatial level?</b></p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/>                      No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>a) If not, what level should it be defined at? (including whether information is already gathered and/or reported at that level and if so where, if not, estimated cost of collecting and</p>	

reporting it)	
<p><b>5. Should data for this indicator be provided for any or all of the different equalities strands (please tick the relevant box)?</b></p>	<p>Ethnicity <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Gender <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Religion <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Age <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Sexual orientation <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Disability <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Other <input type="checkbox"/> (Please specify)</p>
<p>a) For any boxes ticked at 5, is this information already gathered and/or reported and, if so, where? If not, what would be the estimated additional burden of collecting and reporting it?</p>	
<p><b>6. Further comments on the questions above and /or any other comments that are not covered above questions.</b></p>	
<p>Completed versions can be sent to <a href="mailto:niconsultation@communities.gsi.gov.uk">niconsultation@communities.gsi.gov.uk</a>. Hard copy responses should be returned to Local Government Quality and Performance Division, Zone J2, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Eland House, Bressenden Place, LONDON, SW1E 5DU.</p>	