

SCOPING REVIEW OF THE SUPPORTING PEOPLE DISTRIBUTION FORMULA

Shaun Bennett
Civis Policy Consultation
Research

Email: shaun@civis.co.uk

This paper was commissioned by the Communities and Local Government
Housing Analysis and Surveys Expert Panel

The views expressed are those of the author and should not be taken as representing the view of
Communities and Local Government.

Published by the Centre for Housing Policy, University of York , 2009

© The Author

Contents

Executive Summary

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Context**
- 3. Key findings**
- 4. Recommendations**

Executive summary

Introduction

Supporting People is a major Government programme that funds housing related support services: non-statutory services that aim to help individuals maximise their ability to live independently where the main barrier to that independence is their ability to gain access to and maintain their accommodation. The programme was introduced in April 2003.

In developing the programme, the Government was keen to move the funding of Supporting People from its historic, legacy basis to be in line with other areas of Government funding through the introduction of a needs-based capitation funding formula. Such formulae are used in health, local government and policing to decide how to share a national budget between local areas, based on the size of the local population and other factors considered to drive differences between local areas in need for relevant services. The Supporting People Distribution Formula (SPDF) started development in 2001 and has been used since 2007-8 to determine grant awards for each of the 149 Supporting People administering authorities in England.

Scope

Through the development and implementation of the formula, concerns have been raised about the appropriateness, timeliness and coverage of data used to measure relative differences between authorities in need for housing related support. In September 2008, the Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG) commissioned Civis to undertake a scoping review of the SPDF, with the objectives of:

- to review existing data sources and the level of deprivation applied;
- summarise any issues identified with the data sources and deprivation applied;
- make recommendations for addressing the issues in order to inform any future work.

Method

This scoping review examined the formula at three levels:

1. its overall design, to assess whether the design is consistent with other funding formulae, consistent with its overall policy objectives and is appropriate given its purpose;
2. its function, to determine whether the individual components within the formula have been constructed appropriately and in a way that is consistent with other funding formulae; and
3. its use of data, to determine whether the data used at each level of the formula are appropriate, reasonable and up to date, and whether alternative data should be considered.

The review was conducted as a desk top exercise and has included discussions with relevant stakeholders in the Department for Health, Home Office and others.

Findings and recommendations

This report sets out the findings of this review and a number of recommendations for taking forward work on the formula. In making these recommendations, the review team has considered the wider policy context within which the formula operates. In November 2008, the Government announced that ringfencing arrangements in place since the programme's launch would be removed from 2009/10, giving local authorities greater flexibility around how and where to spend Supporting People grant budgets. Further, the Government announced that from 2010/11, Supporting People funding would be allocated via the Area Based Grant (ABG). ABG is a non-ringfenced general grant which will allocate some £5b of funding to local authorities.

In terms of the three levels which were examined as part of the review, the following recommendations have been made:

1. The overall **design** of the formula was the subject of much consultation during its development and was also critically appraised by external experts in funding formulae. Overall, the design is reasonable and is consistent with formulae in other areas. The review team identified four important issues that merit further consideration, namely:
 - the SPDF measures relative differences in populations at risk and not in need;
 - the formula does not include any measure of service utilisation;
 - the formula's design is consistent with health funding formulae but not with formula grant; and
 - the formula does not take full account of population changes in the four Sustainable Communities growth areas.

The review team concluded that none of these issues were material to the design and function of the formula and made no recommendations around changing the design of the formula.

2. In terms of its **function**, the formula is constructed from a number of components. These are:
 - population at risk;
 - deprivation; and
 - cost.

The output of each of these components is combined with ONS population data to determine the weighted population for each local authority. This is then combined with the standard spend per head to give a target allocation. **The review team considered whether each of these components was reasonable, appropriate and defensible. This review suggests that**

each component does meet these criteria, with one exception in relation to the population at risk component for older people.

The team found that the deprivation component lacked transparency around its operation and recommended that **further work might be considered to set out how and why deprivation was used, measured and taken account of in the SPDF.** This was considered particularly important because some of the measures of population at risk used in the formula are implicitly affected by local levels of deprivation, and it is important not to ‘double count’ deprivation when assessing relative need for funding between local authorities. It was also considered important because of the complex relationship between deprivation and need for housing related support.

3. Finally, the review team examined **data used** within the formula to determine whether these were appropriate and up to date and whether alternative data might be included in further versions of the formula. Specifically, the review team focused on those Supporting People client groups where concern has been raised about the current formula, namely offenders, people with mental health problems, people with alcohol misuse issues, women escaping domestic violence and young people at risk. The review team concluded that in relation to data used within the formula, there are a number of areas where improvements could be made. Should further work on the SPDF be commissioned it should take account of these alternative sources and investigate them in more detail. **The alternative sources of data identified by this review include those for:**

- **offenders,**
- **people with mental health, and**
- **young people at risk.**

Further work should be undertaken ahead of the determination of the next spending review allocations in these areas. **We consider that this work would be relatively straightforward and should not require the commissioning of a large piece of research.**

In relation to single homelessness, the review team recommends a regular scoping review of the CORE data in relation to new lettings to non-statutory homeless individuals to assess whether the issues with data completeness and quality have improved. Again, this work should be relatively straightforward and should not require the commissioning of a large piece of research.

Finally, in relation to alcohol and women at risk of domestic violence, the review team has not found any suitable alternative data that should be considered further.

1. Introduction

In September 2008, Civis was appointed to conduct a scoping review of the Supporting People Distribution Formula. The formula has been used since 2007/08 but limits the maximum percentage increase or decrease in allocation an authority can receive on an annual basis. Previous grant allocations were based on historic funding levels, inherited by the programme at its launch in 2003. These funding levels were determined by take up of housing benefit and a number of unrelated, grant based funding streams. It is important to stress that the formula does not determine how much should be spent on Supporting People across England: it simply distributes this national 'pot' to local authorities based on a number of objective factors.

The SPDF used since the 2007-8 settlement had been in development for some time. Its overall inception and proposed approach and various proposed versions of the formula had been the subject to extensive consultation. In the final consultation, before the use of the formula, local authorities and other stakeholders raised some issues about the appropriateness of some of the data used in the formula and data gaps. The most significant data gaps relate to offenders, people with alcohol problems, people with mental health problems, and the robustness of homelessness data.

This review aims to ensure, as far as possible, that any future work on SPDF is a targeted piece of work that will produce outputs capable of ensuring the SPDF is as robust as reasonably possible, and that will satisfy HM Treasury and other key stakeholders. The specific objectives of the review were:

- to review existing data sources and the level of deprivation applied;
- summarise any issues identified with the data sources and deprivation applied; and
- make recommendations for addressing the issues in order to inform any future work.

1.1 Method

The formula has been reviewed at three levels, namely:

- its overall design, to assess whether the design is consistent with other funding formulae, consistent with its overall policy objectives and is appropriate given its purpose;
- its function, to determine whether the individual components within the formula have been constructed appropriately and in a way that is consistent with other funding formulae; and
- its use of data, to determine whether the data used at each level of the formula are appropriate, reasonable and up to date, and whether alternative data should be considered.

The review has not examined the technical operation of the formula, as it has been subjected to rigorous quality assurance during its development and prior to its use. Where alternative approaches have been considered, or alternative data

reviewed, this has been an initial assessment and further work would be necessary if changes to the formula were to be made. Before making recommendations, the review team has considered the policy and funding context around the programme.

The review was largely a desk-top exercise, which involved examining published documents around the programme and the formula itself, responses to the various consultations on the formula and published documents and reports on funding formulae in other relevant areas (namely local authority funding and primary healthcare funding). We have also had discussions with relevant individuals in CLG, Department of Health, London Councils, Greater London Authority and the Home Office around the formula design and data issues. Initial findings were reported to the CLG project board, and further advice sought on various data issues arising from that discussion.

2. Context

2.1 Background

Supporting People is a major Government programme that funds housing related support services: non-statutory services that aim to help individuals maximise their ability to live independently where the main barrier to that independence is their ability to gain and maintain their accommodation. The programme was introduced in April 2003. Prior to that date, housing related support services were funded through housing benefit and through a number of other revenue streams such as Supported Housing Management Grant (SHMG) and Probation Accommodation Grant Scheme (PAGS). Services had developed where local circumstances allowed with most of the services linked to specialist accommodation. Many services developed as stand-alone services, unconnected to wider health and social care services that users might need or access.

Between 2001 and 2003, the majority of services were funded through Transitional Housing Benefit (THB). This had been introduced following a 1997 court decision that housing benefit should not be used to fund housing related support services. THB's main aim was to 'size the pot' prior to the launch of the programme in 2003, that is to say to determine how much housing benefit was being spent on such services. A second, often implicit, aim was to 'grow the pot' ie to develop more services prior to the launch of the programme. Available evidence¹ suggests that THB helped to increase the provision of services across the country, but that this increase was piecemeal and was not dependant on strategic factors such as local need and gaps in provision. THB therefore underpinned the development of services that did not necessarily address the strategic needs of the local communities in which they sat.

As one of the objectives of the 1998 proposals for the introduction of the Supporting People programme², the Government was keen to put funding of the programme on a needs-based footing. In December 2001, the then Department for Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR)³ consulted on the development and introduction of a needs-based allocation formula⁴.

Allocation formulae have been used by Government since the early 1970s as a means of allocating shares of national budgets to local or regional delivery agencies. First introduced in healthcare, a formula is developed that seeks to measure relative differences between local areas in the cost of delivering a standard level of service. Formulae are largely capitation-based, and use various data to measure differences between local areas. They have sometimes been

¹ Review of the development of policy and costs of housing related support since 1997 (2004) Matrix Research and Consultancy Ltd, Department for Communities and Local Government

² Supporting People: a new policy and funding framework (1998) Department for Environment, Transport and the Regions

³ During the lifetime of the development of the formula, the sponsoring Government department has changed its name several times. The initial work was commissioned by DETR, the second phase by ODPM and the final work by CLG.

⁴ Developing an allocation formula for Supporting People: consultation paper (2001) Department for Environment, Transport and the Regions

controversial. Much criticism has been laid against them by those organisations receiving funding, as they do not measure actual cost or need for services. Their prime focus is not to determine how much each local area should receive in funding, but rather how a set national budget should be shared between local areas. Funding formulae are rarely used on their own to allocate funding: ‘floors’ and ‘ceilings’ are used to limit year to year changes in grant allocations and transitional arrangements are often put in place when formula reviews lead to major changes in how target allocations are developed. In recent years, the policy objectives of formulae have been changed by Government. For example, in 2003 the funding formulae for primary healthcare was changed to meet the policy objective of closing the gap in health inequalities between local areas. This was controversial, with the Government accused of bending funding towards more deprived (and more supportive) areas.

Needs Based Formula for Supporting People

The proposal set out in the 2001 consultation paper to introduce a capitation, needs-based formula for the funding of Supporting People services received a mixed reception, with a majority of the respondents in favour of this proposal. Issues were raised by respondents around how the formula would measure differences between local authorities in need for housing related support services and what data would be used to underpin the formula. Back in 2001, few quantitative data were available around housing related support services. Government did not know where such services were located, the size and cost of such services, how many and what type of clients were accessing such services and how to measure, strategically, the need for such services. There were not readily available data that might be used as a ‘proxy’ to measure relative differences between local authorities in the need for housing related support. As part of the implementation of the Supporting People programme and to support the development of the formula, the then DETR undertook work to map the supply of services locally and to develop a needs assessment process that was to be piloted in 15 local authorities.

The first version of the formula was published for consultation at the end of 2003. The needs assessment work had not been taken forward and needs data that directly measure need for Supporting People services were therefore not available. There were a number of gaps in the first version of the formula and a number of proxy data were used as measures of relative need between local authorities. Comparing the target allocation generated by the formula with existing grant levels resulted in huge potential swings for local authorities. This was to be expected, partly because of the large differences between local authorities in both the level of existing service provision and the unit costs of this provision. Authorities with similar population levels and socio-economic profiles and that were geographically close to each other often had wildly divergent levels of service provision and unit costs. Another important factor was the lack of exclusivity between type of provision: in some local authorities, provision was labeled as hostel accommodation for single homeless people and in others as supported housing for drug users, even though both provided a similar service to similar service users.

The final report on the first version of the formula was published at the end of 2003. It recommended that the formula was not introduced and that further work was done to improve the function of the formula. On the basis of these recommendations, the then Office of the Deputy Prime Minister commissioned a second phase of development of the formula. While the overall design remained fairly consistent, the functioning components of the formula and the data used in the formula significantly changed. The available data on housing related support services locally had improved much since the launch of the programme, as had nationally available datasets on a range of publicly funded services and those accessing them. This version of the formula was subject to consultation with local authorities and other stakeholders, conducted at the end of November 2005 and closing in February 2006.

Following this consultation, further work was done to develop the formula. This included updating the population data used in the formula and other data used and removing the cross authority adjustment allowance. Outside the formula, changes were also made to the floor and ceilings and other factors used to limit year or year fluctuations in actual allocations for local authorities. Most importantly, the overall funding available for the programme in England was reduced. The formula was used to allocate grants in 2008/9, 2009/10 and 2010/11, subject to a floor (a maximum reduction allowed) of five per cent and a ceiling (a maximum increase allowed) of seven per cent. Over these three years, the total national budget available for Supporting People services reduced by nearly £50m to £1.63b. The intention is that the formula will guide the next spending review allocations but, subject to resource, redistribution would not be pursued after that period.

2.2 Policy context

In reviewing the current formula and making recommendations about whether and how it should be further developed and changed, it is important to understand the policy and funding context within which such changes might operate.

In July 2007, the Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG) published *Independence and Opportunity*, its strategy for the future of the Supporting People programme. This set out a number of policy intentions for the funding of the programme. The most significant of these in terms of the future development of the formula is the proposal to include Supporting People grants within the Area Based Grant. Area Based Grant (ABG) is a non-ringfenced, general grant of around £5b that replaces a myriad of former specific grants made to local authorities. In 2007, the Government proposed that Supporting People would be included as one of the grants transferred to the ABG from 2009-10, subject to the outcome of pilot schemes⁵. In November 2008⁶, the Government announced that the Supporting People funding would remain as a named, separate grant system for 2009/10 but that the ringfencing arrangements (in place since 2003, for all authorities except those assessed as

⁵ Area based grants, general guidance (2008) Department for Communities and Local Government

⁶ www.communities.gov.uk/news/corporate/1075788

‘excellent’ by the Audit Commission) would be removed for 2009/10, giving all authorities greater flexibility about how and where Supporting People grants might be used. Finally, the Government announced that the national Supporting People grant would form part of the Area Based Grant scheme from 2010/11.

From its inclusion in the Area Based Grant scheme from 2010/11 the Supporting People programme will be the largest single funding stream transferred to the ABG, accounting for over a third of the total pot and three times larger than the second largest transferring grant. There are no problems with the continued use of SPDF for the allocation of Supporting People grant when it is paid through ABG. A number of grants already paid through ABG are allocated based on formulae, for example many of the Department for Health grants are allocated based on the Relative Needs Formula.

The Government has already announced grant levels for each Supporting People administering authority for each year through to 2010-11. Any changes made to the SPDF would therefore only have an impact from April 2011 onwards, and would by that stage probably be out of date and would require a further review.

A second important consideration is the interaction between the reducing national budget for Supporting People and the impact of SPDF driven grant allocations. Over the three year period of the 2007 Spending Review grant allocations (2008/9 to 2010/11), the national budget for Supporting People services has reduced by almost three per cent, from £1.68b in 2008/9 to £1.63b in 2010/11. Therefore, all local authorities should have expected to see a reduction in their grant levels even had the formula not been used to allocate grants for these years. Government put several limits on the impact of the formula. These limits meant that most authorities saw no change in their overall grant levels, and no local authority would expect to see a cut in their grant levels of more than five per cent between years and an increase of no more than seven per cent between years.

As these floor and ceiling levels are based on individual grants between years, they do not take account of the overall reduction in the national budget. The impact of this is that the formula only accounts for a proportion of grant changes for those authorities that experienced a reduction in their grant, further limiting the real impact of the formula. The converse is that for those authorities that received an increase, the interaction of the formula ceiling and the overall reduction in the national budget is that the real increase experienced by these authorities is higher than the seven per cent ceiling.

The table below illustrates the interaction between the reduction in the national budget available and the floor and ceilings applied to changes in individual authority grant allocations.

Formula based grant allocations						
	2007/8	2008/9	2009/10	2010/11	Change 2008/9 to 2010/11	
					Change	% Change
National budget	£ 1,688,192,674	£ 1,680,569,382	£ 1,660,603,010	£ 1,632,150,920	-£ 56,041,754	-3.32
Change		-£ 7,623,292	-£ 19,966,372	-£ 28,452,090		
% Change		-0.45	-1.19	-1.71		
LA 1	£ 11,152,392	£ 10,594,772	£ 10,065,034	£ 9,561,782	-£ 1,590,610	-14.26
LA 2	£ 15,934,504	£ 15,934,504	£ 15,934,504	£ 15,934,504	£ -	0.00
LA 3	£ 7,626,132	£ 8,159,961	£ 8,731,159	£ 9,342,340	£ 1,716,208	22.50
Grant allocations without formula (assumes reductions applied equally to all authorities)						
	2007/8	2008/9	2009/10	2010/11	Change 2008/9 to 2010/11	
					Change	% Change
National budget	£ 1,688,192,674	£ 1,680,569,382	£ 1,660,603,010	£ 1,632,150,920	-£ 56,041,754	-3.32
Change		-£ 7,623,292	-£ 19,966,372	-£ 28,452,090		
% Change		-0.45	-1.19	-1.71		
LA 1	£ 11,152,392	£ 11,102,032	£ 10,970,132	£ 10,782,174	-£ 370,218	-3.32
LA 2	£ 15,934,504	£ 15,862,549	£ 15,674,091	£ 15,405,537	-£ 528,967	-3.32
LA 3	£ 7,626,132	£ 7,591,695	£ 7,501,500	£ 7,372,973	-£ 253,159	-3.32

Figure 1: Impact of budget reduction and formula application

Of the 149 Supporting People administering authorities that received grant allocations in England, some 68 saw no change in the grant levels over the period 2007/8 through to 2010/11. During this period, the national available budget reduced by a total of 3.32%, and these 68 authorities have therefore benefited from the method used to apply floors and ceilings in determining grant allocations. LA 2 in the table above is one such example. Had the reduction in the national budget been equally applied to all authorities without the formula, LA 2 would have seen its grant reduced by c£530k between 2007/8 and 2010/11. However, the application of the floor and ceiling arrangements means that this authority has seen its grant remain at 2007/8 levels.

Some 55 administering authorities have seen their grants reduced over the period of the 2007 Spending Review allocations, of which 11 have seen their grants reduced by the maximum amount (five per cent each year). As LA 1 in the table above illustrates that from a grant of £11.2m in 2007/8, it has seen its grant reduce by just over fourteen per cent by 2010/11 (c£1.6m). However, had the reductions in the national budget been equally applied to all authorities, LA 2 would have seen its budget reduced by £370k.

Some 26 administering authorities have seen their grant allocations increase, of which eight authorities have received the maximum year on year increases. LA 3 in the table above illustrates this. The impact of the interaction between the formula floors and ceilings and the overall reduction in the national budget is significant for authorities in the position of LA 3. Had the reductions in the national budget been equally applied to all local authorities, LA 3 would have seen its grant reduced by around £250k. However, its grant allocation was increased by the maximum allowed under the pace of change arrangements. It saw its grant increase year on year by seven per cent, with a combined increase

of £1.7m. The interaction of the ceiling arrangements and the reductions in the national budget is that, in real terms, this authority has benefited considerably.

The impact of this interaction between the reducing national budget and the application of pace of change arrangements leads Civis to make two further recommendations for the future of the formula. The interaction of pace of change arrangements and changes in funding levels in other formulae-based grant systems has similar impacts as experienced by Supporting People, and this impact is both to be expected and consistent with formula objectives. However, in many other funding areas, the level of floor and ceilings applied and the inclusion of other transitional arrangements limit the extent of the impact more than can be seen in Supporting People allocations.

The first recommendation in this area is therefore that CLG should ensure it takes account of the interaction when determining future pace of change arrangements for authorities. The second recommendation is that CLG make clear the impact of the formula on grant levels in terms of the floor and ceiling applied and changes to the national budget.

3. Key findings

3.1 Overall design of the SPDF

The formula is a weighted capitation formula. It allocates an amount of money per adult resident in each local authority in England for each of the client groups associated with the programme. The total pot available for each client group is determined outside the formula and is based on historic funding levels: for example if client group 'A' accounted for ten per cent of overall spending in 2003, it is likely that it will be allocated ten per cent of overall funding in the formula in each year through to 2010-11.

The formula recognises that the number of people in each local authority is only one factor in determining how much an authority would need to spend to deliver a standard level of service. The formula therefore 'weights' the resident population to account for these other factors. During the development of the formula, a number of different factors were identified and assessed to determine whether and how they should be included. Research and statistical analysis were used to determine these other factors, which include:

- the proportion of the resident population that is in each of the twenty one client groups associated with the programme. The 'population at risk' component of the formula measures relative differences between local authorities in the number of adults with learning disabilities or the number of people who misuse drugs, for example;
- relative differences in the level of deprivation between local authorities; and
- relative differences in average staffing costs between local authority areas.

The overall design was the subject of much consultation during the formula's development and was also critically appraised by external experts in funding formulae. Overall, the design of the formula is reasonable and is consistent with formulae in other areas. There are, however, four important issues that merit further consideration. These four issues are set out in detail in the following paragraphs, but can be summarised as:

1. the SPDF measures relative differences in populations at risk and not in need;
2. the formula does not include any measure of service utilisation;
3. the formula's design is consistent with health funding formulae but not formula grant; and
4. the formula does not take full account of population changes in the four Sustainable Communities growth areas.

These four issues are considered in greater depth below.

1. The SPDF measures relative differences in populations at risk and not in need

Population at risk can be thought of as the proportion of the population that is affected by a particular issue or circumstance, regardless of whether they need housing related support services. It is therefore the number of people with learning disabilities, for example, and not the number of people with learning disabilities with a housing related support need.

It is important to understand that there is a complex relationship between risk and need and that this relationship is unlikely to be uniform between local authorities: just because two local authorities have a population at risk of five per cent of their resident population does not mean that the proportion of that population at risk that has a need for publicly funded housing related support services will be of a similar level.

Homeless families can provide a illustrative example of this issue. Both Gateshead and Southwark have similar levels of homeless families (in terms of the number of households accepted as homeless and in priority need as a proportion of the total number of households). The allocation formula would therefore weight the resident populations of these two local authorities to a similar extent. However, research evidence⁷ suggests that housing supply affects the level of need for housing related support within the homeless family population: basically, where access to housing is more difficult, a higher proportion of homeless families will need housing related support. This research would suggest that Southwark's population should receive a higher weighting than Gateshead's because, although it has similar levels of homeless families, more of its homeless families will be in need of support.

This position is both unavoidable and more consistent with wider Government policy around needs assessment. As part of this review, our team has considered issues around joint strategic needs assessments and the compatibility of these with the formula. In particular, work published by the Department of Health⁸ has been considered. The 'population at risk' approach and specific data used to measure relative differences between local authorities in their populations at risk are consistent with those set out by many local authorities in the joint strategic needs assessments and by the Department of Health in its work on this matter. Further, while not impossible, there would be a significant amount of work around consulting upon and implementing any measurement of relative need for inclusion within the formula. There is no single measure of need for housing related support that would meet the assessment criteria for inclusion within the formula. Estimating need for housing related support would involve using a number of different data and assumptions, and any calculations would

⁷ The support needs of homeless households (2003) Department for Communities and Local Government

⁸ Joint strategic needs assessment core dataset (2008) Department of Health, Association of Public Health Observatories

be both open to methodological challenge and would create unacceptable perverse incentives⁹.

2. The formula does not include any measure of service utilisation

A second and perhaps related issue in terms of the overall design of the formula is that it lacks any measure of utilisation of existing housing related support services. The formula only considers relative differences in the populations at risk between local authorities. Many allocation formulae include some use of utilisation data (data on existing service provision, service spend or number of people accessing services) as key variables. Such data are used for a number of reasons, including the lack of other alternative data sources and the outcome of statistical analyses.

The lack of any measure of utilisation or of supply in the SPDF formula could explain the distance between previous grant levels and target allocations generated by the formula for some local authorities. The supply map across the country is uneven and does not follow any discernable pattern, particularly when considering it at the client group specific level. Local authorities with similar population levels, levels of deprivation and population at risk of drug abuse, for example, do not share similar levels of housing related support provision for this client group. **However, including utilisation in the formula would be at odds with the overall policy objectives of the SPDF.** From the outset, the SPDF has taken a needs-based approach. Using supply data within the formula would simply replicate existing funding levels, which is exactly what the formula is being used to move away from. And while Supporting People utilisation data have not been directly used in the formula, it is not correct to say that the formula does not account for this:

- some of the data used to measure population at risk are themselves utilisation data for publicly funded services. RAP¹⁰ data are used as measures of learning disability and physical disability in the formula, and could be used to measure relative differences in need for mental health service provision. RAP data are a measure of the number of people presenting for assessment for local authority care services; and
- utilisation data should have been used to determine whether and how different deprivation factors should be used in the formula. Such statistical modeling is consistent with the use of utilisation data in other formulae.

⁹ Such an approach to estimating need has been used in London, the north west, Birmingham and across the four Sustainable Communities Growth Areas, based on a method developed by the National Housing Federation for the Greater London Authority. However, that method is an absolute measure of need: It is not attempting to divide up a pot of money by calculating relative differences between local authorities.

¹⁰ Referral, Assessment and Packages of care data provide data on adult social care and were introduced in 2001. These data are collated by the Department of Health.

3. The formula's design is consistent with health funding formulae but formula grant

The basic approach taken in the SPDF is consistent with that taken in healthcare, where the average spend per capita can be adjusted upwards or downwards depending on the relative weighting of the resident population. A PCT which is below the national average across a range of factors included in the formula will therefore get the resident population weighted below its actual population.

Formula grant is largely distributed using the socio-economic and demographic characteristics of the authority, together with the number of band-D equivalent properties within the authority's area. Government applies the same formula to all authorities that provide the same services and use the best data that are available on a consistent basis across all authorities. Every authority receives at least a minimum percentage increase year-on-year (the 'floor') on a like-for-like basis i.e. after adjusting for changes in funding and function. In order to pay for the cost of the floor, the increase above the floor for all other authorities is scaled back.

The formula for each specific service area is built on a basic amount per client, plus additional top ups to reflect local circumstances. The top ups take account of a number of local factors which affect service costs, but the biggest factors are deprivation and area costs.

The two approaches are both considered robust ways of formula allocation, but start from a different stand point. While this different approach is unlikely to be significant, it may affect both understanding and acceptance of the SPDF and would also create problems if the allocation of Supporting People grant were to be included in the formula grant system as an alternative to the area based grant proposal.

4. The formula does not take full account of population changes in the four Sustainable Communities growth areas

These growth areas cover some thirty local authorities in London, the south east and east of England. They are likely to have an impact on population levels over the next twenty years, over and above the population increases projected by the Office of National Statistics. The SPDF target grant allocations through to 2010-11 are based on the 2004 population projections. These themselves have been updated and upwardly revised for many local authorities and will not fully account for population increases in the growth areas. In healthcare, an outside of formula adjustment is made to primary care funding to account for the impact of this unaccounted for population growth. This adjustment has been in place since 2003. In deciding whether to include such an adjustment in Supporting People grants, there are four issues that Civis recommends should be considered:

- no such adjustment is made for local authority funding allocations. Making a growth area grant adjustment might be at odds with wider funding policy in the department;

- even if such an allocation is made, this generally would be done outside the formula;
- measuring the additional impact of housing growth on population levels over the next twenty years is a difficult and controversial process, particularly if such measurement was used to make funding decisions between local authorities; and
- even before the impact of the credit crunch, evidence suggests that local authorities were struggling to meet their housing growth targets. CLG might consider whether any additional population growth above that already accounted for in the ONS population projections is likely and of such an extent that additional funding is required.

3.2 Function of formula components

The formula itself is constructed from a number of components. These are:

- population at risk;
- deprivation; and
- cost.

The output of each of these components is combined with ONS population data to determine the weighted population for each local authority. This is then combined with the standard spend per head to give a target allocation.

The technical functionality of each of these components has not been assessed as part of this review, as such functionality has been subjected to extensive quality assurance tests during the development of the formula. However, the review has considered each component and whether it is reasonable, appropriate and defensible. This review suggests that each component does meet these criteria. The one exception is in relation to the population at risk component for older people.

The formula uses an age adjustment when determining the population at risk for the three older people groups associated with the Supporting People programme. The use of this age adjustment is consistent with other formulae (particularly health and personal social services). The basic assumption underlying this age adjustment is that need for housing related support increases with age: therefore, local authorities with relative larger populations of people aged 85 and over will be relatively more needy than others. This assumption came out of research conducted during the development of the proto-type formula and involving Supporting People teams and other stakeholders. At the time of this research, little quantitative work had been conducted around the presenting needs of people living in sheltered accommodation. The assumption that need increases with age might reflect a health or social care understanding of need: it could be argued that the need/age relationship is a curve, with housing related support need reducing with age at a given turning point.

However, little comment was made by consultees on the age adjustment factor and it may not be possible to determine this relation on any more robust basis than the Delphi study conducted in 2003 in the development for the formula.

Further, there are data that may be used to in the formula that might more appropriately reflect relative differences in need for publicly funded housing related support services. Other research has used the number of people aged 60 and over in receipt of pension credits or the number of people aged 60 and over self identifying as living with a long term illness when measuring need for housing related support for older people. It is also important to understand that, in addition to age, relative differences in the level of deprivation between local authorities is also accounted for in the formula's consideration of the three older people's groups.

One area that did raise issues through the various consultations undertaken during the development of the formula is that of deprivation. It is widely accepted that deprivation has an impact on the level and nature of need for housing related support services. The impact of deprivation on support need is complex, and impacts at a number of levels: on the level of need in the population, the level of social housing need and its impact on support need, the impact on individual need arising from the interaction of personal factors (for example, 'multiple' need) and on the ability of an individual to contribute to the cost of their support. Much work has been published on this, and throughout the development of the formula there was a sizeable stakeholder voice that deprivation should be taken account of within the formula.

Ideally the composition of the deprivation index should have been developed through extensive statistical testing of different deprivation data to assess the nature and extent of their relationship with relative differences in per capita supply of services in England. Such testing is used in all other allocation formulae to determine which data should be included. Using such an approach, only where a positive correlation between relative differences in the supply of Supporting People services and in different measures of deprivation is determined will those measures have been included in the formula. Without validating the analysis undertaken in the development of the formula it is not possible to say whether appropriate data have been used.

This does lead the review team to highlight one concern about the deprivation index within the formula. The basis for inclusion of data within the deprivation index and its application within the formula is not clear from the published work around the formula. Discussions with CLG and their discussions with the team involved in developing the formula suggest that the inclusion of specific data was not based on such analyses, but have taken account of other factors including stakeholder consultation. Further work is needed to increase the transparency of the deprivation index. This further work might include some analytical work to demonstrate the relationship between need for Supporting People and the specific data included in the deprivation index. In undertaking this work, there are three difficult factors here that need to be considered:

1. The first is the complex relationship between need for social housing and the need for housing related support and the impact of this relationship might have on the impact of deprivation on need for Supporting People services. Published research suggests that need for housing related support services is higher in areas of greater social

housing need for some client groups, and the demand and provision of some forms of housing related support services in some boroughs across England certainly reflect housing need and lack of access to housing as much as need for housing related support. Long average lengths of stay in hostels for single homeless people and woman at risk of domestic violence have long been associated with the lack of next move accommodation, for example. In including deprivation as a factor within the formula it is essential to understand and be able to quantify relative differences between local authorities in the extent to which deprivation is a factor in driving need that isn't accounted for elsewhere in local authority funding arrangements.

2. The second important factor is the available data that might be used to measure relative differences between local authorities in deprivation. The Index of Multiple Deprivation is a useful tool in many respects but one of its greatest flaws is that it does not allow us to understand the relative differences between local authorities. Within the IMD, very few datasets are capable of measuring relative differences between local authorities, and this somewhat limits the scope of data that might be used. The current deprivation index is a complex amalgam of different data from the IMD and other data associated with the impact of deprivation on need for housing related support. It would be helpful to set out more explicitly the basis for using these data.
3. Finally, some of the measures of population at risk used within the formula are themselves measure of relative deprivation between local authorities. For example, the number of people accessing a drug treatment programme by local authority reflects the local level of deprivation: local authorities with higher levels of deprivation will have more people accessing drug treatment services. The formula takes this into account by compressing the impact of the deprivation index when it is applied to the calculation of target allocation. Again, more transparency as to why and how these compression factors have been applied would be of use.

However, as stated earlier, there is a general consensus that deprivation is a factor that drives relative differences in need for Supporting People services between local authorities. The three issues outlined above would not raise questions about whether to include a deprivation index, simply whether sufficient analysis has been undertaken to substantiate the use of particular data. As the IMD has not been updated since 2004, it is questionable whether such analyses would lead to the early inclusion of different data. **This would not suggest that a substantive piece of formula review work is warranted or likely to lead to major changes in the formula.**

3.3 Data used in the formula

One of the key drivers for this scoping review was concerns raised in the last consultation on the formula around some of the data used in the formula. There were three basic concerns:

- in some areas of the formula, data to measure relative differences between local authorities were missing or had not been included;
- that some data used were not appropriate measures of these relative differences; or
- that some data used were out of date.

During the development of the formula, considerable and regular work was done to identify and assess data that might be used to in different components within the formula. As part of this review, it has not been possible and not considered necessary to repeat this work. However, since the development work on the current formula was completed, much work has been done on joint strategic needs assessments. In completing this review, each data used in the formula (whether to measure population at risk, deprivation or cost) has been assessed and reviewed against published reports on JSNA and in discussion with appropriate staff in relevant Government departments.

In undertaking this work, the review team has assessed alternative datasets against the key criteria used throughout the development of the formula. Namely, the data must be robust, their use defensible, they must be capable of measuring relative differences between local authorities across England and they must be free of perverse incentives. These criteria are essential to ensure the formula is robust and treats all local authorities on an equal basis. They do mean, however, that many locally collected data cannot be used in the formula.

3.4 Data gaps

The availability and usefulness of different data to measure populations at risk has improved considerably since development work began on the formula in 2001. Existing data have improved to the extent that they can now be used, and many new datasets have come on stream. In addition to improvements in data, there have also been improvements in the accessibility of such data. Data repositories such as POPPI and PANSI are now available and commonly used by local authorities when measuring need for specific services.

- POPPI (Projecting Older People Population Information) uses data based on the 2001 Census and trend data produced by the Office of National Statistics for populations aged 65 and over at the local authority level; and
- PANSI (Projecting Adult Needs and Service Information) is similar to POPPI but provides information for adults aged between 16 and 64.

Both these and other data repositories have significantly improved how data are accessed and analysed. They do not, however, include any new data that have not previously been considered and assessed in the development of the Supporting People Allocation Formula.

Much work has also been done to improve the understanding and use of needs assessment approaches in the provision of public services. Most recently, Government has published advice on data that may be used to measure need at

the strategic level: the Department for Health's Joint Strategic Needs Core Dataset. This was published in the summer of 2008, and contains information on different data that might be used to measure need at a local authority level. In undertaking this review, each of the relevant data set out in this document have been assessed for their potential use in the SPDF, unless the data have previously been reviewed in the development of the formula.

Despite this, there remain particular gaps in terms of offenders, mentally disordered offenders, people with mental health problems, people who misuse alcohol and women escaping domestic violence. These gaps are discussed below.

Offenders

Most of the data around offenders are actually measures of incidence rather than prevalence: they measure the number of crimes recorded in a local area rather than the number of criminals. There have been considerable improvements in data around individuals receiving probation services, as reported through OASys.

OASys (Offender Assessment System) was introduced in 2003 by the National Offender Management Service (NOMS, which combines the National Probation Service and HM Prison Service). OASys was based on previous probation assessment systems, and provides and records data in relation to a structured and standardised system for assessing the likelihood of recidivism, criminogenic factors associated with offending and level of risk posed by the offender (both to themselves and others). They also record assessment of access to accommodation, financial management and income and other socio economic factors.

OASys data are recorded at the probation board level. They cover a number of groups: offenders subject to court ordered pre-sentence reports, adult offenders subject to a community order, adults resident in approved probation premises (including those on bail), adults serving six months or more in custody, young offenders serving one month or more in custody and those released from prison on license.

The use of probation data has been considered on a number of previous occasions during the development of the SPDF. The last assessment was shortly after these data first become available, when issues of coverage and completeness prevented their use in the formula. These issues were:

- coverage of population at risk. The data do not provide a complete picture of the offenders and those at risk population, as they exclude individuals not in receipt of some form of probation service. A key exclusion was therefore individuals whose custodial sentence was lower than six months, a key target group in terms of preventative services (both in relation to single homelessness and those at risk of offending);
- completeness. While these data did provide a relatively good picture of the number of assessments conducted by probation services, some of the

specific data sets (such as access to accommodation and financial management and income data) have significant issues in terms of completeness; and

- accessibility. Data were recorded and reported at probation board level, which is generally co-terminus with the forty eight police force constabularies in England and Wales.

Since the introduction of OASys in 2003 and the work by the Reducing Reoffending Accommodation Pathway Board (a current Ministry of Justice and CLG project board), data available on offenders have improved considerably. Data are now available at the local authority level on the number of offender assessments, offender assessment including accommodation status and the nature and suitability of accommodation. Data are also available in relation to different stages of the NOMS journey, including data recorded for PSA 16 *Offenders under probation supervision living in settled and suitable accommodation at the end of their order or licence.*

Different OASys data have different problems in relation to their usefulness for measuring relative differences between local authorities in the offender and at risk of offending population. In general, all OASys data have issues with coverage, as they exclude offender and at risk populations not in receipt of some form of probation service. Specific data within OASys (such as the PSA16 data) have issues with regards to completeness and usefulness, and low levels of completions raise issues with year on year comparisons. However, it is worth considering one or more of the OASys data in the SPDF and further work on this area is therefore recommended.

Mental Health

In terms of mental health, there have been widely reported historical problems in data that may be used to measure this population. Over the lifetime of the development of the SPDF, there have been significant issues identified with available data to measure this population. Robust data are available in terms of inpatient care, but these measure a relatively small proportion of this population and are, to some extent, a measure of where acute psychiatric wards are located rather than where people with mental health problems might live.

At the last update of the formula in 2004, a further review of available data was undertaken. The formula team identified RAP data as a potential source for measuring this population. RAP data (Referral, Assessment and Packages of care in adult persona social services) were introduced in 2001. Since then, changes have been made to the data collected.

RAP data covers individuals who are referred, assessed and receive packages of adult social services care during a period of a year. Data are collected on the number, type and referring body for referrals made to social services departments; on the number and type of assessments undertaken and on the number and type of social care packages commenced and completed. Data are collected in relation to age (18 to 64 and 65 and over) and primary client group (physical disability, learning disability, mental health, substance misuse and vulnerable people). The most appropriate data to use within the formula are A1: Number of new clients for whom the first assessment was completed during the period by primary client type and age group. These data are used within the current formula in relation to learning disabilities and physical disabilities, on the advice of the Department of Health. Data on referrals was not considered appropriate because of issues of data definition and potential perverse incentives.

RAP A1 Data in relation to mental health were not used in the current formula on the advice of the Department of Health. There were significant issues of completeness of these data at the time: for the 2003-4 return, some 45 local authorities made a full return of data on new assessments while some 105 made a partial return.

Even last year (2007), some councils were raising issues about the completeness of RAP data on mental health, and work has been undertaken to exclude data on the 18 to 64 age group from the proposed performance indicator 133 on timeliness of care packages following assessment. Changes to the data collected and definitions have also been made over the lifetime of these data. These changes may affect completeness of data (reporting has been voluntary for some data were less than six months notice of changes were given).

In addition to issues of completeness, there are also issues with coverage. RAP data only relate to individuals referred for, assessed for or in receipt of social care services. There are a number of people with mental health issues who may need housing related support services that might not be referred or assessed because of the nature and extent of their mental health problems. These

individuals may include homeless people, people with mild and intermittent personality problems and others that are not on the radar for social services departments. Despite these two problems, discussions with the Department of Health for this review suggest that further work might be needed in this area.

Over and above RAP data, work is ongoing by the Department of Health on the development of a mental health minimum dataset (MHMDS). The Mental Health Minimum Data Set (MHMDS) covers specialist mental health services provided in the community, as well hospital and outpatient care. It covers services for adults of working age and people over the age of 65. The MHMDS has been compulsory for NHS providers since April 2003 and some information was published for 2003-2004 and 2004-2005. However, these data are not considered as an alternative potential measure to the RAP data for two reasons:

- there are issues with coverage. These data provide information on specialist mental health services only (using secondary NHS mental health services, detailed under the Mental Health Act or on a CPA (Care Programme Approach) care package). As such, they only cover a small proportion of the mental health population and are focused on high levels of need: they therefore exclude most people with mental health issues who would be in need of housing related support services; and
- there are significant issues with completeness. Although there is evidence of improvements in data returns, there are still significant issues which have an impact on the quality of the data and their appropriateness for use in the SPDF.

People with Alcohol Problems

In terms of people who misuse alcohol, there are again well documented problems arising from the lack of available data to measure the prevalence of this issue. National prevalence data are available from a number of sources. The British Crime Survey includes information on the number of alcohol-related offences, the General Household Survey and Health Survey for England both contain information on levels of alcohol consumption and research evidence also allows for assessment of severity of alcohol dependence using the SAD-Q test. Each of these provides a useful way of assessing alcohol use, misuse and dependence nationally, but these are of no use for a formula that allocates funding based on relative differences between local authorities. During data reviews undertaken in the development of the SPDF, each of these data were assessed and rejected as they did not meet the criteria for use in the formula. Other data have been previously rejected as they failed to meet the assessment criteria. These included local survey data, as these were not available across all local authorities.

The Department of Health's Joint Strategic Needs Assessment Core Dataset, published in the summer of 2008, includes a number of different ways of measuring prevalence of alcohol misuse at the local authority level. These include:

- local survey data on prevalence (where available). There are two issues with using these data. First, data definition and collection methods are not standardised between local areas and cannot be used to measure relative need. Second, evidence suggest that many local authorities have not conducted such surveys; and
- modeled estimates of binge drinking at the local authority level. This model¹¹ was developed by the National Centre for Social Research and uses national data collected via the Health Survey for England. It models binge drinking at the local authority level using these national data and gives an **expected** (not actual) prevalence based on its population characteristics. It does not account for any local factors that might affect binge drinking rates. The potential use of these modeled prevalence rates requires consideration, but there are significant issues in relation to the use of this model for the SPDF. The nature of the model is expected prevalence rather than actual, and this would put use of these data at odds with other allocation formulae. At the local authority level, the prevalence rate is subject to a confidence interval of CI95% of +/-2%. This limits the use of these data in an allocation formula and would probably result in a rejection by key stakeholders in the use of these data. Finally and probably most significantly, these modeled estimates only cover binge drinking. Binge drinking is a particular type of alcohol misuse behaviour and is unlikely to be an acceptable measure in relation to need for housing related support.

Discussions with the Department of Health suggest that Heath Survey for England data are available, and it is theoretically possible to use such data over a number of health surveys and through special analysis to determine relative differences between local authority areas. However, the likelihood of wide confidence intervals arising from such analysis and availability at a PCT level only would suggest this data might not be of potential use.

Women at risk of domestic violence

In relation to women at risk of domestic violence, few data are available that help measure prevalence of this issue. Those data that are available do not lend themselves to use within the formula itself, because of issues of coverage, completeness or robustness. During the development of the formula, much work was done to identify and assess different data, including data on report and recorded crime, PIE data on local authority homelessness decisions and data arising from the British Crime Survey 2004. Since the last assessment undertaken in the development of the formula, there have not been any significant changes in the data available that might measure prevalence of this population.

¹¹ Health lifestyle behaviours: model based estimates for middle layer super output areas and local authorities in England 2003-5 (2007) National Centre for Social Research

3.5 Inappropriate data

In some areas of the formula, data have been used as a ‘proxy’ to measure relative differences in populations at risk between local authorities. The use of such proxies is generally based on research evidence or statistical analysis that suggests the data could be used in this way.

Single homelessness

For single homelessness, there is a huge literature on the difficulties of measuring the prevalence of this population. Throughout the many data reviews undertaken in the development of the SPDF, no data that allow us to measure the prevalence of single homelessness at the local authority level in any robust way were identified.

The formula currently uses PIE data on homelessness decisions as a proxy measure, but this presents a number of issues. In particular, it uses data on the decisions around households that local authorities deem homeless but not in priority need and those households that are in priority need but do not include children. These were considered an appropriate proxy for single homelessness, a group which itself is difficult to define.

PIE data cover data on decisions on homelessness applications made under the Housing Act 1996 (and 1985). As such, they are a useful measure of statutory homelessness (ie of households where the local authority has a duty to house) and have limited use in terms of measuring single homelessness, which by definition covers a number of individuals for whom a local authority would not have a duty to house. The PIE does collect data on a subsection of the single homeless population - those on whom a decision has been made, but were not accepted as owed a main duty because they were not in priority need. The problem is that the PIE does not give any indication on single homelessness among those that have not approached the LA.

The only other potentially available national source of data in relation to single homelessness is CORE. CORE (COntinuous REcording) is a national information source funded jointly by the Tenant Services Authority and the CLG that records information on the characteristics of both housing association and local authority new social housing tenants and the homes they rent and buy. CORE was launched in 1989 following a successful pilot. Around 600 housing associations are now recording more than 125,000 general needs lettings, 90,000 supported housing lettings and 16,000 sales per year. Local authorities were invited to join CORE from April 2004 and over eighty percent of LAs are now participating, with CORE participation now being included in the Audit Commission KLOE's as a measure of performance.

One dataset within CORE that is a potential measure of single homelessness is that relating to new tenancies following an assessment of non-statutory housing need. As part of this review, the team held discussions with the CLG on the potential use of these data in the formula. These discussions suggest there are three limitations with using these data:

- coverage. The data only relate to LA and RSL stock. A number of local authorities, particularly in London, are using private sector stock to manage non-statutory homelessness and this would be excluded from the CORE data.
- completeness. Completion of CORE returns is voluntary, and a number of local authorities do not participate. Where they do, there are also issues with completeness of the return, with some local authorities only completing part-year returns.
- quality of the data returned is variable, though improving over time.

The advice from CLG was that CORE data should not be used in the formula at this time. However, CORE data are continually improving over time and CLG felt that this position should be reviewed in two or three years time.

Young People at risk

The formula currently uses relative differences in the proportion of the population aged 16 to 25 as its measure of population at risk for this client group. However, the Social Exclusion Unit¹² previously defined ‘young people at risk’ as those individuals who did not receive five GCSEs at grades A to C. Data on GCSE results are collated and published annually at the local authority level, and could be used in the formula.

Cost component

Some consultees questioned the data used within the cost component of the formula. The cost component uses data to measure differences in labour costs and to account for increased costs of providing services in rural areas. Both data used were based on the cost adjustment used in the personal social services component of the local government finance settlement. Some consultees raised concerns that these data did not measure actual costs to local authorities of providing services or actual differences between local authorities in costs of delivery. However, the data used are considered appropriate and reasonable and consistent with other funding formulae.

3.6 Out of date data

The formula uses a number of data sets from the 2001 census or that have been published at some point since 2001. The nature of these data is such that there is often a few years gap between the collection of the data, its publication and the next round of data publication. Throughout the development of the formula, issues about the timeliness of data used were raised. The data in the current

¹² Policy Action Team 12: young people (2000) Social Exclusion Unit

formula were updated in 2007 following the close of the consultation and before the publication of the grant allocations for 2007 onwards. Since then, some more current data have been published. In particular, the 2006 ONS population projections are now available and further population projections will be available over the next three years. **The most recent population projections should be used when the formula is updated to produce target allocations for 2011 and beyond.**

4. Recommendations

The recommendations that flow from this preliminary review are intended to inform any future work that may be commissioned on the SPDF.

As there is a commitment to use the formula for the next spending review allocations, the review team recommends that further consideration is given to the level and application of floors and ceilings within the pace of change arrangements, and that the impact of this and changes in national budget should be made clear.

In relation to data used within the formula, there are a number of areas where improvements could be made. Alternative sources of data identified by this review include those for:

- offenders,
- people with mental health, and
- young people at risk.

Further work should be undertaken ahead of the determination of the next spending review allocations in these areas. **We consider that this work would be relatively straightforward and should not require the commissioning of a large piece of research.**

In relation to single homelessness, the review team recommends a regular scoping review of the CORE data in relation to new lettings to non-statutory homeless individuals to assess whether the issues with data completeness and quality have improved. Again, this work should be relatively straightforward and should not require the commissioning of a large piece of research.

Finally, in relation to alcohol and women at risk of domestic violence, the review team has not found any suitable alternative data that should be considered further.

Cluster or Sub-Cluster Group	Client Group	Data Source for Population at Risk index	Alternative Data Sources	Comments
------------------------------	--------------	--	--------------------------	----------

SINGLE VULNERABLE 1	Single Homeless	CLG data on household spaces and accommodation type – total housing (Table KS16, 2006)	CORE data: number of new tenancies following assessment as non-statutory need.	Issues with coverage and completeness. Data should be usable in next three years.
		P1E data from CLG on homeless households in priority need without children and homeless households not in priority need (average taken across 2004/05, 2005/06 and 2006/07)	Homeless Link data on number of bed spaces in London.	Measure of service provision rather than need or prevalence. Issues with perverse incentives. Only available for London.
			CRF data	Reported data only: issues with coverage and representativeness.
	Rough Sleepers	CLG data on household spaces and accommodation type (Table KS16, 2006)	CHAIN data	Only available in London. Measure of presentations rather than prevalence.
		P1E data from CLG on households in temporary accommodation (average taken across 2004/05, 2005/06 and 2006/07)		
		ONS Revised Mid-2004 Population Projections: all ages		
		CLG data on rough sleeping counts (average taken across June 2003, June 2004 and June 2005 numbers)		
	People with Drug Problems	ONS Revised Mid-2004 Population Projections: all ages		
		Healthcare Commission Data on number of individuals recorded by DAT as receiving drug treatment in 2006/07, by DAT of residence		

SINGLE VULNERABLE 1 CONTINUED	People with Alcohol Problems	No particular data used	Alcohol related hospital admission rates (DH JSNA core data set)	Considered and rejected before because of definitional issues and because of distance from data set and need for housing related support.
			Modelled estimates of binge drink, 2003-2005	To be investigated further.
			Heath Survey for England data (longitudinal)	Theoretically possible. Would require more investigation and special analysis. Would be at PCT level and could have wide confidence intervals.

SINGLE VULNERABLE 2	Offenders and Those at Risk of Offending	Uses SV1 population at risk figures (based on the indicators above) as a proxy		
	Mentally Ill Offenders	Uses SV1 population at risk figures (based on the indicators above) as a proxy		
	People with Mental Health Problems	Uses SV1 population at risk figures (based on the indicators above) as a proxy	RAP data on mental health	To be investigated further with DH. Rejected in v3 due to coverage and reliability issues.
			Heath Survey for England (longitudinal)	Theoretically possible. Would require more investigation and special analysis. Would be at PCT level and might have wide confidence intervals.

GENERIC	Generic	Uses SV1 population at risk figures (based on the indicators above) as a proxy		
	Unknown	Uses SV1 population at risk figures (based on the indicators above) as a proxy		

SOCIALLY EXCLUDED	Travellers	ONS Revised Mid-2004 Population Projections: all ages		
		CLG count of Gypsy and Traveller caravans (average taken across Jan 2005, July 2005, Jan 2006, July 2006 and Jan 2007 figures)		
	People with HIV/AIDS	ONS Revised Mid-2004 Population Projections: those aged 20-59		
		Survey of Prevalent Diagnosed HIV Infections (SOPHID): number of individuals seen for HIV-related care in 2005 by GOR and LA of residence		
	Refugees	ONS Revised Mid-2004 Population Projections: all ages	TB notification rates.	Questionable link between TB and refugee rates. Data held at PCT not LA level.
		National Asylum Support Service (NASS) data on number of asylum seekers (end-2005)	Estimated population by migrant status.	DH JSNA core data sets to be investigated but unlikely to be of use.

PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	People with Physical / Sensory Disabilities	ONS Revised Mid-2004 Population Projections: those aged 16-64		
		Department of Health data on number of clients aged 18-64 receiving community-based physical or learning disabilities services following assessment during period 1 Apr 2004 – 31 Mar 2005 (Table P1.1b)		
	People with Learning Disabilities	ONS Revised Mid-2004 Population Projections: those aged 16-64		
		Department of Health data on number of clients aged 18-64 receiving community-based physical or learning disabilities services following assessment during period 1 Apr 2004 – 31 Mar 2005 (Table P1.1b)		

OLDER PEOPLE	Older People with Support Needs	ONS Revised Mid-2004 Population Projections: takes age bands 60-64, 65-69, 70-74, 75-79, 80-84, 85+, and applies weightings	Number of persons in receipt of pension credits by LA area.	Need driven by more than just age.
	Frail Elderly	ONS Revised Mid-2004 Population Projections: takes age bands 60-64, 65-69, 70-74, 75-79, 80-84, 85+, and applies weightings	Proportion of the 65 and over population with a limiting long term illness (POPPI census data)	Self-reported data set. Questionable link between data and frail elderly definitions at local level.
	Older People with Mental Health Problems / Dementia	ONS Revised Mid-2004 Population Projections: takes age bands 60-64, 65-69, 70-74, 75-79, 80-84, 85+, and applies weightings	Prevalence of dementia by age.	National prevalence rates only. Interaction with age index likely to cause problems.

YOUNG PEOPLE	Young People at Risk	No particular data used	GCSE pass rates (DCFS)	Consistent with SEU definition of young people at risk.
	Young People Leaving Care	ONS Revised Mid-2004 Population Projections: those aged 16-25 DfES data on children aged 16 and over who ceased to be looked after during year ending 31 March 2005 (Table 17 – average taken across 2005 and 2006)		
	Teenage Pregnant Women	ONS Population Projections: females aged under 20		
ONS VS2 data on number of teenage births – estimates produced by Teenage Pregnancy Unit (DfES, 2005)				

HOMELESS FAMILIES	Homeless Families	CLG data on household spaces and accommodation type – total housing (Table KS16, 2006)		
	Women Escaping Domestic Violence	No particular data used		