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

Name and address of responding organisation:
Association of London Environmental Health Managers
Chadwick Court
15 Hatfields
London
SE1 8DJ

Is this your organisation's official response to the consultation? Yes

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

National Indicator Number:

14- REVISED DRAFT CIRCULATED 17.12.07

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 □ No ⊠
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.	(a)Who the "assessor" is, who the "advisor" is. A clear indication of what an avoidable contact is - it appears that calls to a call centre forwarded to the appropriate officer/section could be mid call transfers and therefore avoidable contact? Progress chasing and updating are not necessarily avoidable contact and many customers do not consider these avoidable contacts - they appreciate being updated and advised.

2. Does the Technical Definition for this indicator have any unintended consequences?	Yes ⊠ No □	
If YES a. What are the unintended consequences on this national indicator? b. Can the unintended consequence be avoided? If so, how?	Many of the contacts between customers and local authorities are not "avoidable", they are part of information giving, sharing and updating. "Transferring" of calls is not necessarily an avoidabe contact - it is often a very helpful service once a customers needs have been established e.g via a single point of contact number. Retrieving information to assess possible avoidable contact will be a very time consuming and bureacratic process which the Governmernt has pledged it is committed to reducing.	
3. Will the Technical Definitions for this indicator work in practice?	Yes ☐ No ⊠	
If NO a. Why would this technical definition not work in practice?	Definition seeems very unwieldy and unclear	
4. Is this indicator defined at the right spatial level?	Yes ☐ No ⊠	
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)	The cost of collecting or trying to collect this information is likely to be disproportionate to its benefit and will reduce the front line services available to deal with customer service requests because of administrative burden it	

	creates.		
5. Should data for this indicator be provided for any or all of the different equalities	Ethnicity		
strands (please tick the relevant box)?	Gender		
	Religion		
	Age		
	Sexual orientation		
	Disability		
	Other (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.			
Whilst this indicator has been redrafted, it is still very unclear and could prove very expensive for local authorities to measure and not be very informative as an "indicator"			
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, 4 th Floor, Eland House, Bressenden Place, LONDON, SW1E 5DU.			