

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

Name and address of responding organisation:

Devon CC, Trading Standards Service, County Hall, Topsham Road, Exeter EX2 4QH

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:

Paul Thomas

National Indicator Number:

70

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

Indicator Issue	
1. Is the Technical Definition of this indicator clear?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <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.	
2. Does the Technical Definition for this indicator have any unintended consequences?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <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?	The causes and preventative measure for the two categories, unintentional and deliberate injuries, are significantly different. To be tackled effectively an attempt needs to be made to distinguish between the two types of incidents.

3. Will the Technical Definitions for this indicator work in practice?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If NO a. Why would this technical definition not work in practice?	The results can be obtained from the definition but tackling the causes will not be effective because of the disparate nature of the two types of admissions.
4. Is this indicator defined at the right spatial level?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
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 reporting it)	.
5. Should data for this indicator be provided for any or all of the different equalities strands (please tick the relevant box)?	Ethnicity <input type="checkbox"/> Gender <input type="checkbox"/> Religion <input type="checkbox"/> Age <input type="checkbox"/> Sexual orientation <input type="checkbox"/> Disability <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> (Please specify)
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?	
6. Further comments on the questions above and /or any other comments that are not covered above questions.	

Comments from other colleagues:

It is stated that location can be recorded according to place of residence, GP practice, OR Trust where treatment provided. This appears to offer these as alternatives. It would be more useful for analysis if each were provided where possible. In particular the residence enables analysis against Multiple Deprivation data. The location data should not be alternatives as indicated but requirements.

Completed versions can be sent to niconsultation@communities.gsi.gov.uk. Hard copy responses should be returned to Local Government Quality and Performance Division, Zone J2, 4th Floor, Eland House, Bressenden Place, LONDON, SW1E 5DU.