



*National Treatment Agency
for Substance Misuse*

**Statistics from the
National Drug Treatment Monitoring System
(NDTMS)
1 April 2006 - 31 March 2007**



Executive Summary

- Of the **195,464** individuals in treatment contact in England during 2006/07, 175,512 (90%) received at least one Tier 3 or Tier 4 treatment modality as part of their treatment episode.
- A total of **293,325** episodes of treatment were recorded for these clients and **370,854** treatment modalities/interventions were recorded as having been provided.
- Clients' median age (on 30th September 2006, the midpoint of the year) was 31 years and 72% were male. Regions exhibited variation with respect to the proportion of clients aged less than 25 years (from 18% to 29% of clients).
- Most (88%) clients were White. Other ethnic groups each accounted for fewer than three percent of clients.
- Most clients (65%) used heroin, usually as their primary drug (61% of clients).
- Primary cannabis use was common, particularly among clients aged less than 18 years at triage (75% of this group were primary cannabis users, compared to only seven percent of over eighteens).
- Adjunctive use of crack cocaine was common. Primary use was unusual, except in London where primary crack users accounted for 15% of clients.
- The most common routes into treatment were via self (34%), criminal justice (24%), or GP (11%) referral,
- Nearly one half (44%) of episodes that were completed during the year ended in a successful discharge from treatment. For clients aged 20 years or more in the reporting year, the rate of successful discharge increased gradually and consistently with age.
- Three quarters (75%) of the treatment journeys that commenced during the year lasted twelve weeks or more.

Contents

1. Background	3
2. Abbreviations and definitions	5
Abbreviations	5
Definitions	5
3. Methodology	8
Data Model	8
Methodological note	9
4. Key findings on clients in contact with structured drug treatment services	10
Age and Gender	10
Ethnicity	10
Primary and adjunctive drug use	12
Injecting behaviour	13
Referral sources	14
Modalities/interventions provided	15
5. Discharge and Retention	16
Discharge and successful completion	16
Retention in treatment	16
Factors associated with retention and successful discharge	17
6. Regional variations	24
7. Trends	29
Trend in numbers treated	29
Trend in age at triage and gender distribution	30
Trend in primary drug used	30
Trend in referral sources	32
Trend in treatment completion	32
8. Appendix 1 – Variable incompleteness and inconsistency	34
9. Appendix 2 - Notes on numbers in treatment series	37
10. References	38

1. Background

The National Drug Treatment Monitoring System (NDTMS) records information about people receiving tier 3 or 4 treatment for drug misuse in England (i.e. structured community-based services, or residential and inpatient services), in order to monitor and assist the management of progress towards the Government's targets for participation in drug treatment programmes (see www.drugs.gov.uk/drug-strategy).

The drug strategy aims to reduce the harm that drugs cause to society (including communities, individuals and their families) via four principal objectives:

- [Young people](#) – to prevent today's young people from becoming tomorrow's problematic drug users
- [Reducing supply](#) – to reduce the supply of illegal drugs
- [Communities](#) – to reduce drug-related crime and its impact on communities
- [Treatment](#) - to provide treatment and support in order to reduce the number of drug-related deaths and minimise harm.

Each of these objectives is linked to a Public Service Agreement (PSA) target. The overarching aim is to reduce the harms caused by illegal drugs to individuals, their families and the wider community by:

- reducing drug use among young people and preventing them from becoming the problematic drug users of tomorrow
- having a sustained impact on the supply of Class A drugs to the UK and availability within communities
- targeting drug misusing offenders via the Criminal Justice System to engage them in treatment and reduce drug-related crime
- providing treatment for people with drug problems to help them live healthy and crime free lives.

Previously (1990 – 2001), information on new presentations or presentations after a break in contact of six months or more to drug treatment services was collected by Regional Drug Misuse Databases (RDMDs) (Donmall 1999). These were reported in the Department of Health's statistical bulletins for six month periods, starting with the six months ending March 1993 and continuing to the six months ending March 2001. Following a strategic review of the structure and operation of the information systems (Donmall, Hickman, Glavas, 2000), NDTMS was introduced on 1 April 2001, replacing the RDMDs in England. The NDTMS collects data on all clients in contact with treatment services. Responsibility for managing the NDTMS was transferred from the Department of Health to the NTA on 1 April 2003.

The NTA have reorganised the NDTMS, bringing the definition of drug treatment recorded by the system further into line with [Models of care for drug misusers](#). It has also rearranged the operational structure in line with Government Office organisation. In most regions, operation of the NDTMS resides with [Public Health Observatories](#). The dataset and data collection methods have also changed. Between 2001 and 2003, client contact forms were completed on a client's first presentation, and review forms for all clients were completed at year-end. The data collection method was changed for

2003/04 data, being replaced by a system whereby treatment services submit a [core data set of their client information](#), either as a database extract or spreadsheet. Code sets for the core data set can be found in the [NDTMS reference data](#) document.

During 2004/05, the NDTMS implemented a monthly data collection process, which became fully operational in 2005/06. The [core data collected since 2004/05](#) have also been amended.

Results from the NDTMS are used across a number of government departments, including the Department of Health, Home Office, Office of the Deputy Prime Minister and Department for Education and Skills.

This statistical release covers England only. Information on drug treatment in [Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland is also available](#).

2. Abbreviations and definitions

- **Abbreviations**

Black and minority ethnic (BME)

Counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT)

Drug Action Team (DAT)

Drug Treatment and Testing Order (DTTO)

East of England (EA)

East Midlands (EM)

London (LO)

National Drug Evidence Centre, University of Manchester (NDEC)

National Drug Treatment Monitoring System (NDTMS)

No fixed abode (NFA)

National Treatment Agency for Substance Misuse (NTA)

North East (NE)

North West (NW)

Office for National Statistics (ONS)

Primary care trust (PCT)

Public Sector Agreement (PSA)

Regional Drug Misuse Databases (RDMD)

South East (SE)

South West (SW)

West Midlands (WM)

Yorkshire and The Humber (YH)

- **Definitions**

Agency	A provider of services for the treatment of drug misuse. The agency may be statutory (i.e. NHS) or non-statutory.
Attributor	The attributor is the concatenation of a client's initials, date of birth and gender. This is used to isolate records that relate to individual clients.
Client/Individual	Records relating to individual clients are isolated and linked on the basis of first and surname initials, date of birth and gender (<i>attributor</i> code). This minimises the extent of multiple counting within the results reported here.

Discharge date	The discharge date is usually the planned discharge date in a client's treatment plan, where one has been agreed. However, if a client's discharge was unplanned, then the date of last face-to-face contact with the agency is used.
Drug Action Team (DAT)	Drug action teams (DATs) are the partnerships responsible for delivering the drug strategy at a local level.
Episode	An episode of treatment is a set of interventions with a specific care plan. A client may attend one or more modalities/interventions (or types) of treatment during the same episode of treatment. A client may also have more than one episode in a year. A client is considered to have been in contact during the year, and hence included in these results, if any part of an episode occurs within the year. Where several episodes were collected for an individual, attributes such as ethnicity, main drug etc. are based on the first valid data available for that individual.
In contact	Clients are counted as being in contact with treatment services if their date of presentation (as indicated by triage), modality start, modality end, or discharge, indicates that they have been in contact with an agency during the year.
Modality/intervention	A type of treatment, e.g. structured counselling, specialist prescribing etc.
Opiate	A group of drugs including heroin, methadone and buprenorphine.
Public service agreement (PSA)	Government targets on public services.
Presenting for treatment	The first face-to face contact between a client and a treatment provider. Clients are counted as having presented for treatment within a specified period if their date of triage falls within that period.
Structured drug treatment	Structured drug treatment follows assessment and is delivered according to a care plan, with clear goals, which are regularly reviewed with the client. It may comprise a number of concurrent or sequential treatment interventions.

Tiers of treatment	<p>Models of care, forming a four-tier framework for drug treatment:</p> <p>Tier 1 - Non-substance misuse specific services requiring interface with drug and alcohol treatment services</p> <p>Tier 2 – Open access drug and alcohol treatment services</p> <p>Tier 3 – Structured community-based drug and alcohol treatment services</p> <p>Tier 4 – Residential and inpatient services for drug and alcohol misusers.</p>
Treatment Journey	<p>A set of concurrent or serial treatment episodes linked together to describe a spell of treatment whilst an individual is resident in a particular DAT. This can be within one provider or across a number of different providers.</p>
Triage	<p>An initial clinical risk assessment performed by a treatment service. A triage includes a brief assessment of the problem as well as an assessment of the client's readiness to engage with treatment, in order to inform a care plan.</p>

3. Methodology

NDTMS Data are gathered from treatment providers by regional NDTMS centres, provided to NTA, and then forwarded to NDEC for data analysis, processing and verification. The results of these analyses are then supplied to NTA for publication.

NDEC exclude from analyses those records that have:

- a missing agency code
- a modality recorded as tier 1 or tier 2
- a missing date of birth
- an age under 9 or over 75 years at triage
- nicotine or alcohol recorded as the main drug
- an illogical chronological sequence of referral date, triage date and discharge date
- a DAT of residence outside England.

Please note that Regional analyses are based on the DAT where a client resides, regardless of whether the client was treated within that DAT or Region. Thus Regional figures indicate activity for their resident population. This marks a change in methodology since the 2003/04 report which, due to the considerable amount of missing DAT of residence in that year's data, based Regional analyses on DAT of treatment. Data quality has since improved and DAT of residence data are provided for the vast majority (98% or more) of clients, DAT of treatment being substituted as a proxy only when DAT of residence is not provided.


The methodology used to calculate clients' age changed from the 2004/05 report onward, and is calculated at two time points – the date of the client's most recent triage, and the date corresponding to the mid-point of the reporting year (i.e. 30th September 2004). Figures describing age use both of these definitions, as appropriate, and are labelled according to the definition used.

The percentages given in tables are rounded to the nearest per cent. Totals may not add up to 100 due to rounding. Values less than five have been suppressed and associated figures have been rounded to the nearest five in order to prevent deductive disclosure of personal information.

3.1 Data model

The data model used by NDTMS is shown below.

- Each client may receive one or more episodes of care at one or more treatment agencies.
- During each agency episode, the treatment agency may provide the client with one or more treatment modalities or interventions.
- Depending on context, analyses are reported in this document at either the client, episode, or modality/intervention level.



Episodes of treatment are identified by unique combinations of attributor, agency attended and date of triage. They are reported on the basis of the earliest modality records for the episode; that is, those modality records with a common modality start date that is closest to the triage date. The only exceptions to this are discharge date and discharge reason, both of which are taken from the modality record with the latest discharge date. The episode level dataset has one record for each of a client's treatment episodes, each episode comprising the data contained in the subset of modality records for that episode, as described above.

Clients are reported on the basis of their latest episode within the episode dataset defined above. The client level dataset has one record for each client, a client being represented by a unique combination of initials, date of birth, and gender. Please note that, for the sake of consistency with reports for earlier periods, Regional tables are derived by summing the number of individual clients resident in the constituent Partnership areas.

Treatment journeys form the basis for some tables for the first time in this report. The concept of the treatment journey is described in the update to [Models of Care](#). In essence, the operational definition of a journey is that episodes are considered as linked elements of an ongoing treatment journey if they are concurrent, or if 21 days or less elapses between discharge from one episode and starting the next. If a period of more than 21 days does elapse after discharge from a treatment episode, then the next episode is considered to be the start of a new treatment journey.

Inconsistent data items found in combining lines of modality data to form the episode and client-level data are treated as missing and are excluded from the analysis. Tables in this report indicate the number of missing and/or inconsistent records as appropriate.

4. Key Findings

4.1 Age and gender

During 2006/07 NDTMS reported

- 195,464 unique clients, receiving
- 293,325 episodes of treatment, comprising
- 370,854 modalities/interventions.

The age and gender of clients at mid-year (30th September 2006) is shown in Table 4.1.1 and Figure 4.1.1. The majority (72%) of treated persons were male. The average (median) age of clients was 31 years. Most clients (53%) were between the ages of 20 and 35 years, whilst 7% of clients were aged under 18 years.

Table 4.1.1: Age and Gender of clients in treatment during 2006/07

Age group on 30 th September 2006	Male		Female		Persons	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
< 16 years	4,298	3	2,044	4	6,342	3
16 - 17 years	5,208	4	2,130	4	7,338	4
18 - 19 years	4,204	3	2,091	4	6,295	3
20 - 24 years	15,716	11	7,920	14	23,636	12
25 - 29 years	27,884	20	11,544	21	39,428	20
30 - 34 years	29,262	21	10,662	19	39,924	20
35 - 39 years	24,334	17	8,527	15	32,861	17
40 - 44 years	15,738	11	5,500	10	21,238	11
45 - 49 years	7,445	5	2,657	5	10,102	5
50+ years	5,988	4	2,312	4	8,300	4
Total (clients)	140,077	100	55,387	100	195,464	100

4.2 Ethnicity

Table 4.2.1 shows clients' ethnicity. Most (88%, rounded) were White, the majority of these being White British. No other ethnic group accounted for more than three percent of clients.

Figure 4.1.1 Age and Gender of clients in treatment during 2006/07




Table 4.2.1: Ethnicity distribution for clients in treatment 2006/07

Ethnicity	n	%
White British	158,839	84
White Irish	2,225	1
Other White	4,881	3
White & Black Caribbean	2,340	1
White & Black African	508	0
White & Asian	583	0
Other Mixed	1,384	1
Indian	1,786	1
Pakistani	2,006	1
Bangladeshi	1,115	1
Other Asian	1,600	1
Caribbean	3,603	2
African	1,435	1
Other Black	2,286	1
Chinese	114	0
Other	2,106	1
Not stated	2,634	1
Total (clients)	189,445	100
Missing/inconsistent data	6,019	
Total including missing/inconsistent data	195,464	

4.3 Primary & adjunctive drug use

Table 4.3.1 shows the main drug of misuse among clients treated in 2006/07. The data are shown for those aged less than 18 years at triage, those aged 18 years or over, and for all persons receiving treatment. Most (75%) of those aged under 18 years used cannabis as their main drug, other drug types each accounting for less than 10% of clients, with heroin accounting for six percent. In contrast, most (66%) over eighteens used heroin as their main drug, with only seven percent reporting primary cannabis use.

Table 4.3.1: Main drug of misuse by age at triage for clients in treatment 2006/07

Drug	Aged less than 18 years at triage		Aged 18 years or over at triage		All persons		Median age at triage
	N	%	n	%	n	%	
Heroin	965	6	117,305	66	118,270	61	31
Methadone	30	0	10,822	6	10,852	6	34
Other Opiates	41	0	5,428	3	5,469	3	34
Benzodiazepines	47	0	2,117	1	2,164	1	36
Amphetamines	375	2	5,477	3	5,852	3	32
Cocaine	716	5	10,078	6	10,794	6	28
Crack	181	1	10,664	6	10,845	6	32
Hallucinogens	35	0	205	0	240	0	24
Ecstasy	477	3	575	0	1,052	1	18
Cannabis	11,582	75	13,087	7	24,669	13	18
Solvents	317	2	189	0	506	0	15
Barbiturates	0	0	22	0	22	0	30
Major tranquilisers	<5	0	<22	0	22	0	42
Anti-depressants	<5	0	<301	0	301	0	37
Other drugs	44	0	755	0	799	0	32
Poly use; no details	77	1	313	0	390	0	31
Drug Free at triage	463	3	1,005	1	1,468	1	28
Total (clients)	15,355*	100	178,360*	100	193,715	100	
Missing/inconsistent data	52		1,697		1,749		
Total including missing/inconsistent data	15,410*		180,060*		195,464		


* Totals rounded to nearest 5 as indicated

A total of 118,270 primary heroin users were reported to have received treatment during the year, accounting for 61% of treated persons. In total, 134,591 primary opiate users were reported, accounting for 69% of treated persons for whom drug use details were available. Primary cannabis use was reported by 24,669 (13%) treated persons, of whom 47% were aged under 18 years (note that under eighteens accounted for only eight percent of the treated population as a whole). As a group, primary cannabis users had an average (median) age of 18 years, compared to 31 years for heroin users. Use of other drugs as a primary substance was less common: six percent of treated persons

were primary methadone users, six percent cocaine users, and six percent crack users. Other drugs each accounted for less than five percent of treated persons.

Note that Table 4.3.1 does not show adjunctive drug use by clients. NDTMS gathers details of clients' primary drug and of up to two additional drugs that they may use. Figure 4.3.1 shows the number of clients using a selection of drugs, either as a primary or adjunctive drug. As shown, the vast majority of heroin users used this drug as their primary substance. In contrast, most crack users used crack as a secondary drug.

Figure 4.3.1: Primary and adjunctive use of selected drugs: number of clients using each drug: NDTMS 2006/07



4.4 Injecting behaviour

Injecting status at presentation for treatment was recorded for 157,559 clients (81%). Of these, 40,932 (26%) were currently injecting. A further 40,717 clients (26%) had previously injected but were not doing so at the time of presenting for treatment. The remaining 75,910 (48%) clients had never injected.

Of clients who were primary heroin users, 37% were current injectors. Of primary methadone users, 48% had previously injected. Most primary users of cannabis (95%), solvents (93%), ecstasy (91%) and cocaine (91%) had never injected.

4.5 Source of referral into treatment (episodes)

Information about source of referral was provided for 281,545 episodes. Self-referrals (34%) were most common, followed by GP referrals (11%) and referrals from other statutory drug services (10%), the latter reflecting movement between agencies within the treatment system. Non-statutory drug services accounted for a further seven percent of referrals. The criminal justice system (CJS) accounted for 24% of referrals in total. The Drug Interventions Programme or Arrest Referral comprised the most common CJS source, accounting for nine percent of episodes, with the probation service accounting for a further seven percent. Other sources each accounted for fewer than five percent of referrals.

Table 4.5.1: Referral source for episodes reported during 2006/07

Referral source	n	%
Self	96,960	34
GP	32,228	11
Drug Service Statutory	28,868	10
Arrest Referral/DIP	25,370	9
Drug Service Non-statutory	19,393	7
Probation	18,619	7
DTTO	8,156	3
CARAT/Prison	7,764	3
Youth Offending Team	7,072	3
Psychiatry	4,085	1
Social Services	2,186	1
Education Service	2,029	1
Community Care Assessment	1,606	1
Accident and Emergency	1,117	0
Employment Service	820	0
Syringe Exchange	791	0
Connexions	657	0
Looked after Children	411	0
Other	23,413	8
Total (episodes)	281,545	100
Missing/inconsistent data	11,780	
Total including missing/inconsistent data	293,325	

4.6 Modalities/interventions provided

Table 4.6.1: Treatment modalities provided during 2006/07

Modality	n	%
Specialist prescribing	116,522	34
Structured psychosocial intervention	59,317	17
GP prescribing	51,472	15
Other structured intervention	50,475	15
Structured day programme	28,672	8
YP* Psychosocial intervention	11,908	3
Inpatient treatment	7,773	2
Residential rehabilitation	5,859	2
YP* Harm reduction services	4,447	1
YP* Criminal justice interventions	3,174	1
YP* Specialist pharmacological intervention	1,168	0
Other YP* specific intervention	810	0
Total (modalities)	341,597	100
Missing modality data	29,257	
Total including missing data	370,854	

* - Young Person's

A total of 341,597 records included information about the type of treatment modality provided. Table 4.6.1 describes the number of separate occasions on which each modality type was provided. Together, specialist (34%) and GP (17%) prescribing accounted for over one-half (51%) of the occasions on which the intervention type was reported. Counselling (psychosocial intervention) accounted for 17% of the treatment interventions provided to clients during 2006/07. Other, unspecified, structured interventions accounted for 15% and structured day programmes for eight percent. Other types of intervention each accounted for less than five percent.

Table 4.6.2 describes the waiting times associated with treatment modalities available to those clients over the age of 18 at triage, for both first and subsequent interventions. Typically, clients waited less than three weeks for treatment to start in around 80-90% of cases, with the exceptions of residential rehabilitation and inpatient detoxification – both tier four modalities. Around 30% of occurrences of these modality types had waiting times of greater than three weeks.

Table 4.6.2: Waiting times for treatment modalities provided during 2006/07

Modality	First Intervention			
	Waiting time less than or equal to 3 weeks		Waiting time greater than 3 weeks	
	n	%	n	%
Inpatient detoxification	921	73	347	27
Specialist prescribing	20,136	85	3,524	15
GP prescribing	8,301	89	1,030	11
Structured counselling	13,508	87	1,961	13
Structured day care	5,258	91	516	9
Residential rehabilitation	671	67	327	33
Other structured intervention	14,218	90	1,515	10
Total	63,013	87	9,220	13

Modality	Subsequent Interventions			
	Waiting time less than or equal to 3 weeks		Waiting time greater than 3 weeks	
	N	%	n	%
Inpatient detoxification	2,422	68	1,128	32
Specialist prescribing	14,518	89	1,822	11
GP prescribing	6,848	88	945	12
Structured counselling	7,505	84	1,454	16
Structured day care	6,578	89	781	11
Residential rehabilitation	1,375	68	655	32
Other structured intervention	8,098	89	1,016	11
Total	47,344	86	7,801	14

Modality	All Interventions			
	Waiting time less than or equal to 3 weeks		Waiting time greater than 3 weeks	
	n	%	n	%
Inpatient detoxification	3,343	69	1,475	31
Specialist prescribing	34,654	87	5,346	13
GP prescribing	15,149	88	1,975	12
Structured counselling	21,013	86	3,415	14
Structured day care	11,836	90	1,297	10
Residential rehabilitation	2,046	68	982	32
Other structured intervention	22,316	90	2,531	10
Total	110,357	87	17,021	13

5. Discharge and Retention

5.1 Treatment discharge and successful completion

Of the 293,325 treatment episodes that were current for at least part of 2006/07, there were 119,769 that ended during the year. The reason for discharge was provided for 119,629 of these episodes. Table 5.1.1 describes the number of episodes according to the reason for discharge. Forty-four percent of episodes resulted in a successful discharge, defined as being referred on, completing treatment, or completing treatment drug free.

The most common reason for successful discharge was an onward referral (19%), a similar proportion of episodes resulted in treatment completion (17%), and eight percent of episodes ended because the client had completed treatment and was drug free.

Note: The term 'drug free' here relates to treatment context; 'referral on' is usually a successful outcome in which a client is referred on for a form of treatment considered appropriate at that point in their care.

The most common reason for ceasing treatment was drop-out; 33% of episodes terminated for this reason. Seven percent of episodes ended because the client was imprisoned and four percent because treatment was withdrawn. Other reasons each accounted for less than five percent of episodes. One percent of episodes ended because the client died.

Table 5.1.1: Discharge reason for episodes completed during 2006/07

Discharge Reason	n	%
Referred on	22,821	19
Treatment completed	20,329	17
Treatment completed drug free	9,036	8
Successful completion subtotal	52,186	44
Dropped out/left	39,988	33
Prison	8,172	7
Treatment withdrawn/breach of contract	4,992	4
Moved away	3,480	3
Not known ¹	2,719	2
No appropriate treatment available	992	1
Died	765	1
Other	6,335	5
Total (episodes discharged)	119,629	100
Missing/inconsistent data	140	
Total including missing/inconsistent data	119,769	

¹ i.e. where agency staff indicated that they did not know the reason for discharge

5.2 Retention in treatment

The number of clients aged 18 years or over who started a treatment journey during the year was 80,280 (see Section 3.1 for an operational definition of a treatment journey). Of these, 60,392 (75%) were retained in treatment for at least twelve weeks at their last treatment journey. Table 5.2.1 describes the breakdown of the retention figures, by related discharge reason. Please note that for consistency with other national reporting, these figures are derived by summing the figures for Partnership areas.

Table 5.2.1: Retention and discharge reason figures for treatment journeys occurring during 2006/07

Discharge Reason	Retention Status							
	Retained		Not retained, started modality		Not retained, did not start modality		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Not discharged	41,409	69	-	-	-	-	41,409	52
Planned discharge	5,596	9	2,914	20	379	8	8,889	11
Referred on	2,601	4	2,240	15	928	18	5,769	7
Prison	1,436	2	1,110	7	293	6	2,839	3
Other	9,328	16	8,562	58	3,436	68	21,326	27
Total	60,370	100	14,826	100	5,036	100	80,232	100
Missing/inconsistent data	22		21		5		48	
Total including missing / inconsistent data	60,392		14,847		5,041		80,280	

5.3 Factors associated with retention and successful discharge

Successful discharge from a treatment episode might be associated with a variety of factors pertaining to the client, their route into treatment, the type of agency that they attend and the type of treatment that they receive. Table 5.3.1 shows the number and proportion of treatment episodes that were discharged successfully according to clients' ethnic group.

Table 5.3.1 Successful discharge by ethnicity for completed episodes reported to NDTMS 2006/07

Ethnicity	Successfully discharged	
	n	% ¹
White British	43,476	44
White Irish	540	40
Other White	1,175	41
White & Black Caribbean	652	40
White & Black African	148	41
White & Asian	162	45
Other Mixed	323	36
Indian	578	50
Pakistani	489	38
Bangladeshi	274	33
Other Asian	412	43
Caribbean	977	41
African	362	39
Other Black	622	39
Chinese	15	36
Other	514	43
Not stated	422	38
Total	51,141	100
Missing/inconsistent data	1,045	
Total including missing/inconsistent data	52,186	

¹Proportion of episodes discharged with known discharge reason for which the discharge reason was 'Referred on', 'Treatment completed', or 'Treatment completed, drug free', by ethnicity

It should be noted that some ethnic groups are represented by very small numbers, hence between-group differences should be treated with caution. For example, only 15 episodes completed during 2006/07 involved Chinese clients. There is, therefore, a much higher degree of uncertainty surrounding the percentage of these that were discharged successfully (36%) than for ethnic groups represented by larger numbers.

Figure 5.3.1 shows the proportion of episodes successfully discharged according to the type of modality that was provided. Specific Interventions for Young People exhibited the highest successful discharge rate, followed by Tier Four interventions (in-patient treatment and residential rehabilitation) and Structured Psychosocial Intervention. Successful discharge rates for other types of intervention were between 41% and 45%.

Figure 5.3.1: Percentage of episodes successfully discharged by type of modality provided: 2006/07




Figure 5.3.2 shows successful discharge rates according to the source of referral into treatment. Successful discharge rates were highest for episodes involving a referral from Young Peoples' Services (Education Service, Pupil Referral Unit, Connexions, Social Services and Looked After Children), and for referrals within the treatment system (from statutory drug services or GPs). The lowest successful discharge rates were observed following self-referral and criminal justice referral.

Figure 5.3.2: Percentage of episodes successfully discharged by source of referral: 2006/07




Figure 5.3.3: Percentage of episodes successfully discharged by main drug: 2006/07





Figure 5.3.3 shows successful discharge rates according to the main drug used by clients at the start of each completed episode. Rates were highest for primary methadone or cannabis users, and lowest for primary heroin or crack users. The higher rate for cannabis users may be due to the types of intervention provided to this group, which may be shorter in duration and may have different criteria for 'completion'.

Figure 5.3.4 shows successful discharge rates by age group. Rates were highest for the youngest age groups. For those aged 20 years or more, rates of successful discharge gradually and consistently increased with age.

Figure 5.3.4: Percentage of episodes successfully discharged by age group (age on 30.09.2006): 2006/07



Note that there appeared to be associations between successful discharge and being aged less than 20 years, referral from young persons' services, provision of young peoples' treatment interventions and primary cannabis use (which was more common among young clients). It is highly likely that these four factors are interrelated and it is possible that a minority of them are at the root of the observed association with discharge success, or indeed that other related factors have a causal role.

Figure 5.3.5: Percentage of episodes successfully discharged by Region of residence: 2006/07




Figure 5.3.5 shows successful discharge rates according to the Region in which clients lived. Rates varied from 35% to 52%, depending on area of residence.

Table 5.3.2 shows the number and percentage of treatment journeys, starting during 2006/07, that lasted 12 weeks or more according to the client's ethnic group. As noted above (Table 5.3.1) some ethnic groups are represented in only a very small number of treatment journeys, hence between-group differences should be treated with caution. For most ethnic groups, treatment retention rates fell within a fairly narrow range, between 68% and 76%.

Figure 5.3.6 shows the percentage of clients that were retained in a treatment journey lasting twelve weeks or longer according to clients' age at mid-year. It appears that a smaller percentage of younger clients were engaged in treatment journeys that last twelve weeks or more, although it should be noted that young persons' interventions are often designed to be brief.

Table 5.3.2: Retention by ethnicity for clients starting treatment journeys during 2006/07

Ethnicity	Retained	
	n ¹	% ²
White British	48,279	76
White Irish	732	74
Other White	1,656	75
White & Black Caribbean	815	75
White & Black African	170	69
White & Asian	171	73
Other Mixed	434	73
Indian	659	73
Pakistani	689	72
Bangladeshi	407	68
Other Asian	544	75
Caribbean	1,283	71
African	512	70
Other Black	817	69
Chinese	24	60
Other	706	72
Not stated	877	72
Total	58,775	75
Missing/inconsistent data	1,617	
Total including missing/inconsistent data	60,392	

1 – Number of persons starting a treatment journey, that lasted 12 weeks or more, during the year

2 - Percentage of treatment journeys that started during 2005/06 that lasted for 12 weeks or more, by ethnicity

Figure 5.3.6: Treatment retention by age at mid-year - percentage of treatment journeys: 2006/07




Figure 5.3.7 shows the percentage of clients that were retained in a treatment journey lasting twelve weeks or longer according to clients' Region of residence. Between 71% and 80% of clients were retained in a treatment journey for twelve weeks or longer, depending on area of residence.

Figure 5.3.7: Treatment retention by region of residence – percentage of treatment journeys: 2006/07




Figure 5.3.8 shows the percentage of episodes that formed the start of a journey that lasted twelve weeks or more according to the source of referral. A smaller percentage of episodes referred by young peoples' services resulted in a treatment journey of twelve weeks or more. This might be expected, given that interventions for young people may tend to be of shorter duration.

Figure 5.3.8: Treatment retention by referral source – percentage of episodes at the start of a treatment journey: 2006/07





Figure 5.3.9 shows the percentage of episodes that formed the start of a journey that lasted twelve weeks or more according to the primary drug that the client was using at the time. There is a clear tendency for opiate users (methadone, heroin, & other opiates) to be more likely than users of other drug types to be retained in treatment journeys lasting twelve weeks or longer.

Figure 5.3.9: Treatment retention by primary drug – percentage of episodes at the start of a treatment journey: 2006/07



6. Regional Variations.

This section considers Regional variation with respect to some key data categories. To highlight differences, readers may wish to contrast proportions at Regional level with those for England as a whole.

Table 6.1.1 NDTMS 2006/07: Gender and age-group at 30.9.2006 of clients in treatment by Region of residence¹

	NE	NW	YH	EM	WM	EA	LO	SE	SW	England
< 16 years (%)	4	4	2	3	2	2	4	4	2	3
16-17 years (%)	4	3	2	4	4	3	4	5	3	4
18-19 years (%)	3	3	2	4	4	4	3	4	3	3
20-24 years (%)	18	8	13	16	17	13	9	12	12	12
25-29 years (%)	28	15	26	26	25	20	16	20	21	21
30-34 years (%)	21	22	25	21	20	21	17	19	22	21
35-39 years (%)	12	22	16	14	14	16	18	16	17	17
40-44 years (%)	6	14	8	7	8	11	14	11	11	11
45-49 years (%)	2	5	3	3	3	6	8	5	5	5
50+ years (%)	2	4	2	3	3	4	7	5	4	4
Male (%)	74	72	72	73	74	70	72	71	72	72
Female (%)	26	28	28	27	26	30	28	29	28	28
Male (n)	9,001	28,124	19,980	11,361	15,834	10,009	27,285	14,121	15,037	150,752
Female (n)	3,176	11,116	7,891	4,217	5,554	4,309	10,848	5,707	5,916	58,734
Total (n)	12,177	39,240	27,871	15,578	21,388	14,318	38,133	19,828	20,953	209,486
M:F Ratio	2.83	2.53	2.53	2.69	2.85	2.32	2.52	2.47	2.54	2.57

¹Regional figures derived by summing figures for their constituent Partnership Areas. England figures derived by summing the Regional figures; hence movement of clients between Partnership Areas results in multiple counting of individuals

Table 6.1.1 shows clients' age (on 30.09.2006) and gender distribution according to their Region of residence. Regions were very similar with respect to clients' gender distribution, between 70% and 74% being male. Most Regions follow a broadly similar pattern with respect to age distribution, but there were differences with respect to the modal age of clients that suggest an older client population in the North West and in London and younger populations in the North East, East Midlands and West Midlands. This is demonstrated in Figure 6.1.1, which shows the percentage of clients aged less than 25 years, by Region. Less than 20% of clients in the North West or London were aged 25 years or under (on 30.09.2006), compared to 29% in the North East, 27% in the West Midlands and 26% in the East Midlands. Nationally (England), 22% of clients were aged less than 25 years. The age distribution within drug user populations is likely to reflect past trends in prevalence, such that younger populations reflect a recent increase in use and older populations reflect an established and, possibly, waning population (Millar et al, 2006).

Figure 6.1.1: NDTMS 2006/07: Percentage of clients aged less than 25 years on 30.09.2005, by Region




Table 6.1.2 shows the distribution of clients' ethnic group, by Region. Whilst in most Regions more than 90% of clients were White, in the West Midlands, and more markedly in London, Black and Asian clients accounted for a larger proportion of the total. Please note that this table does not account for Regional variation in the ethnic composition of the wider population.

Table 6.1.2 NDTMS 2006/07: Ethnicity of clients in treatment by Region of residence

	NE	NW	YH	EM	WM	EA	LO	SE	SW
White (%)	98	95	92	90	86	90	67	92	94
Mixed (%)	1	1	1	2	4	2	6	2	2
Asian/Asian British (%)	1	1	3	2	6	3	8	2	1
Black/Black British (%)	0	1	1	2	3	2	14	2	2
Chinese (%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other (%)	0	1	1	1	1	1	4	1	0
Not stated (%)	0	0	2	3	0	3	1	2	1
White (n)	11,793	36,749	24,157	13,892	17,677	12,268	25,282	17,187	19,163
Mixed (n)	73	456	360	325	752	298	2,113	325	456
Asian/Asian British (n)	103	547	803	330	1,284	344	2,994	358	127
Black/Black British (n)	14	366	283	336	653	221	5,265	287	370
Chinese (n)	<5	20	<5	<5	<5	<5	72	10	<5
Other (n)	28	213	179	93	129	108	1,316	144	57
Not stated (n)	41	178	463	484	44	360	448	415	293

* Rounded to nearest 5

Table 6.1.3 shows the percentage of clients using each drug as their primary drug, by Region of residence. Heroin users accounted for the majority of clients in all Regions except London, where primary crack users accounted for a very much larger proportion (15%) of clients than in other areas. Outside London, primary crack users accounted for

between two percent and seven percent of clients. Primary methadone users accounted for between two percent and eight percent of clients, primary cannabis users for between seven percent and 16%, and primary cocaine users for between two percent and eight percent.

Table 6.1.3: NDTMS 2006/07: Percentage of clients using each drug as their primary drug by Region of residence

Primary Drug	% of resident clients								
	NE	NW	YH	EM	WM	EA	LO	SE	SW
Heroin	65	64	71	66	74	56	44	61	66
Methadone	5	6	7	6	3	5	8	5	2
Other Opiates	4	3	3	4	2	2	3	3	2
Benzodiazepines	2	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
Amphetamines	4	4	3	4	2	3	1	3	4
Cocaine	4	6	2	3	4	8	8	6	4
Crack	2	3	2	3	3	5	15	4	7
Hallucinogens	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ecstasy	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Cannabis	11	12	7	12	11	16	16	14	11
Solvents	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Barbiturates	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tranquillisers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Antidepressants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Poly use; no details	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Drug Free at triage	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1

As shown in Table 6.1.4, for most Regions self-referral was the most common referral source, accounting for between 26% and 46% of episodes, followed by GP referral, which accounted for between 8% and 23% of episodes. However, self referral accounted for a smaller proportion of episodes for South West (26%) residents and a larger proportion for East of England (46%) and South East (43%) residents. Data for South West residents showed a correspondingly higher proportion of GP referrals (23%) than in other areas. Data for East of England and the South East showed a correspondingly lower proportion of criminal justice referrals (criminal justice referrals accounted for 18% and 22%, respectively). Compared to other areas, there were also lower levels of criminal justice referral for South West (20%) and London (23%) residents. Levels of criminal justice referral were greatest for North East residents (30%).

Table 6.1.4: Referral source for episodes reported during 2006/07, by Region of clients' residence

Referral Source	% of episodes for resident clients								
	NE	NW	YH	EM	WM	EA	LO	SE	SW
Self	33	36	30	30	32	46	36	43	26
GP	9	10	15	9	12	9	8	9	23
Other	9	9	8	10	5	8	7	7	8
Drug Service Statutory	9	11	11	10	11	10	11	7	9
Drug Service Non-stat	4	6	6	11	7	4	7	6	9
Arrest Referral / DIP	11	7	12	11	11	4	10	7	6
Probation	7	7	7	7	10	6	5	7	7
DRR	4	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3
CARAT / Prison	4	3	4	3	4	2	2	2	3
Youth Offending Team	3	3	1	3	3	2	3	3	2
<i>CJS sub-total</i>	30	22	26	25	30	18	23	22	20
Social Services	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
Psychiatry	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	3
Education Service	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Looked After Children	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Syringe Exchange	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Community Care Assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	0
Connexions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employment Service	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
A & E	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Pupil Referral Unit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 6.1.5 shows the number of clients treated according to their Region of residence, unadjusted population rates (numbers per 1,000 population in the same age range in the local population, based on 2006 population estimates) and rate ratios. The latter are calculated by dividing the rate for the Region by the rate for England, thus they help to highlight where Regions differ from the England rate. Please note that the age range covered here (10-74 years) is slightly different to that covered in Table 6.1.1, hence the differences between the Regional and England totals for these tables.

The data suggest that there are differences between Regions with respect to age-specific population rates for treated clients. The North West, for example, exhibited rates for 25-29 year olds that were nearly twice the England 'average', as did the North West for 35-39 year olds. In London, the rate for those aged 45-49 years was double that for England, and the rate for those aged 50-74 years was almost three times higher than 'average'. In the East of England and the South East, rates were below the England 'average' in all age groups.

Table 6.1.5: NDTMS 2006/07: Number of clients treated; unadjusted population rate (per 1,000 persons) for treated clients; & rate ratio for treated clients, by Region of residence.

AgeGroup		Area									
		NE	NW	YH	EM	WM	EA	LO	SE	SW	England
10-14	Number of clients	239	764	245	222	217	123	671	396	213	3,090
15-19		1,093	3,104	1,477	1,450	1,905	1,159	3,369	2,051	1,673	17,281
20-24		2,154	3,157	3,665	2,433	3,589	1,830	3,530	2,433	2,500	25,291
25-29		3,385	5,847	7,259	4,004	5,452	2,894	5,950	3,871	4,381	43,043
30-34		2,548	8,737	7,064	3,235	4,307	3,009	6,397	3,751	4,522	43,570
35-39		1,509	8,600	4,399	2,107	2,994	2,357	6,867	3,138	3,489	35,460
40-44		717	5,468	2,160	1,167	1,614	1,537	5,517	2,153	2,235	22,568
45-49		287	2,096	920	541	734	792	2,997	1,076	1,094	10,537
50-74		236	1,432	659	418	570	616	2,784	956	833	8,504
All 10-74		12,168	39,205	27,848	15,577	21,382	14,317	38,082	19,825	20,940	209,344
10-14	Unadjusted population rate	1.52	1.75	0.76	0.82	0.63	0.35	1.61	0.76	0.69	0.99
15-19		6.28	6.54	4.15	4.91	5.18	3.26	7.63	3.83	5.00	5.18
20-24		11.82	6.71	9.56	8.24	10.10	5.57	6.56	4.90	8.04	7.52
25-29		22.79	14.44	22.93	15.92	17.11	8.69	8.13	7.94	15.73	13.16
30-34		17.05	20.47	22.08	11.89	12.87	8.27	8.64	7.07	15.11	12.68
35-39		8.36	17.01	11.66	6.37	7.48	5.54	10.15	5.05	9.60	9.14
40-44		3.65	10.44	5.61	3.46	4.02	3.53	9.20	3.31	5.84	5.77
45-49		1.57	4.45	2.63	1.81	2.05	2.06	6.16	1.86	3.15	3.05
50-74		0.33	0.78	0.49	0.35	0.40	0.41	1.84	0.44	0.57	0.64
All 10-74		5.86	7.07	6.69	4.40	4.96	3.18	6.20	3.00	5.11	5.11
10-14	Rate Ratio	1.54	1.77	0.77	0.83	0.64	0.35	1.63	0.77	0.70	1
15-19		1.21	1.26	0.80	0.95	1.00	0.63	1.47	0.74	0.97	1
20-24		1.57	0.89	1.27	1.10	1.34	0.74	0.87	0.65	1.07	1
25-29		1.73	1.10	1.74	1.21	1.30	0.66	0.62	0.60	1.20	1
30-34		1.34	1.61	1.74	0.94	1.01	0.65	0.68	0.56	1.19	1
35-39		0.91	1.86	1.28	0.70	0.82	0.61	1.11	0.55	1.05	1
40-44		0.63	1.81	0.97	0.60	0.70	0.61	1.59	0.57	1.01	1
45-49		0.51	1.46	0.86	0.59	0.67	0.68	2.02	0.61	1.03	1
50-74		0.52	1.22	0.77	0.55	0.63	0.64	2.88	0.69	0.89	1
All 10-74		1.15	1.38	1.31	0.86	0.97	0.62	1.21	0.59	1.00	1

Regional figures derived by summing figures for their constituent Partnership Areas. England figures derived by summing the Regional figures; hence movement of clients between Partnership Areas results in multiple counting of individuals

7. Trends

7.1 Trend in the number treated

Figure 7.1.1: Trend in the percentage increase from baseline in the estimated number of individuals in contact with drug treatment services from 1998/99 to 2005/06




Table 7.1.1: Trend in the number of individuals in contact with drug treatment services between 1998/99 and 2005/06

Year	Measured or estimated figure	% Increase from previous year	% Increase from 1998/09 baseline
1998/99 ¹	85,000	-	-
1999/00 ¹	91,000	7	7
2000/01 ¹	99,000	9	16
2001/02 ¹	116,000	17	36
2002/03 ¹	115,500	0	36
2003/04	125,545	9	48
2004/05	160,453	28	89
2005/06	177,055	10	108
2006/07	195,464	10	130

¹See Appendix 2 "Notes on Numbers in Treatment Series"

During 2006/07 NDTMS recorded information about 195,464 individuals (excluding multiple counts between Partnership areas) who were in contact with structured treatment services. Progress towards the PSA target of doubling the numbers in drug treatment has been measured from a baseline estimate of the number of individuals in contact with treatment services in 1998, using trends in the RDMD and NDTMS data. Although the method of measuring the number of persons in treatment has changed, the year-on-year trends using the different systems and counting methodologies provide an indicator of the overall change in the numbers treated. The trend data are shown in Table 7.1.1 and Figure 7.1.1.

7.2. Trend in age at triage and gender distribution

Again, data collection methods have changed over this period, so it is difficult to reach firm conclusions regarding trends. However, there may have been a gradual decline in the proportion of clients aged less than 25 years and a small increase in the proportion that were female (Table 7.2.1).

Table 7.2.1: Trend in clients' age (at triage) and gender between 2000/01 and 2006/07

	2000/01 ¹	2002/03 ²	2003/04 ³	2004/05 ³	2005/06 ³	2006/07
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Age						
Under 25	32	35	29	27	27	26
Over 25	68	65	71	73	73	74
Gender						
Male	74	N/A	72	71	71	72
Female	26	N/A	28	29	29	28

1 – All clients, source: [NDTMS census 2000/01](#), 2 – Clients presenting during year, source: [Statistical release December 2003](#),
3 – All clients

7.3 Trend in primary drug used

Table 7.3.1 (a & b) shows the percentage of clients recorded as using each main drug for the years 2001/02, 2003/04, 2004/05, 2005/06 and 2006/07 split by those aged less than 18 years and those aged 18 or more. Data collection methods have changed considerably during this period, so it is difficult to make precise year-on-year comparisons, particularly for the period prior to 2003/04. Insofar as heroin users have continued to make up the vast majority of those receiving treatment, the pattern appears rather stable. However, there are some indications that the diversity of drug use has change somewhat; for example, the proportion using cannabis as a main drug may have increased, perhaps reflecting increasing service provision for young users (Table 4.3.1 gives a breakdown of the main drug of misuse for clients aged under 18 years and 18 years and over at triage).

Table 7.3.1a: Trend in primary drug used by clients aged 18 years or over between 2003/04 and 2006/07

Drug	2003/04 ¹ %	2004/05 ² %	2005/06 ¹ %	2006/07 %
Heroin	70	67	66	66
Methadone	5	6	7	6
Other Opiates	3	3	3	3
Benzodiazepines	1	1	1	1
Amphetamines	3	3	3	3
Cocaine	4	4	5	6
Crack	6	6	6	6
Hallucinogens	0	0	0	0
Ecstasy	1	0	0	0
Cannabis	6	7	7	7
Solvents	0	0	0	0
Barbiturates	-	0	0	0
Anti-depressants	-	0	0	0
Other drugs	1	1	1	1
Total	100	100	100	100

1 All clients aged 18 years or over

2 All clients aged 18 years or over excluding those treated in the North West region

Table 7.3.1b: Trend in primary drug used by clients aged under 18 years between 2003/04 and 2006/07

Drug	2003/04 ¹ %	2004/05 ² %	2005/06 ³ %	2006/07 %
Heroin	20	14	8	6
Methadone	0	0	0	0
Other Opiates	0	0	0	0
Benzodiazepines	0	0	0	0
Amphetamines	4	3	3	2
Cocaine	3	3	4	5
Crack	2	2	2	1
Hallucinogens	0	0	0	0
Ecstasy	5	4	3	3
Cannabis	61	68	75	75
Solvents	3	2	2	2
Barbiturates	-	0	0	0
Anti-depressants	-	0	0	0
Other drugs	1	2	2	4
Total	100	100	100	100

1 All clients aged 11-17 years at triage

2 All clients under 18 years at triage excluding those treated in the North West region

3 All clients under 18 years

7.4 Trend in referral source

Table 7.4.1 shows the distribution of referral source for each year. Again, note that the system of data collection has changed considerably during this period. However, there is a reasonably clear trend towards clients entering treatment via an increasing variety of referral routes, with a consequent fall in the proportion entering via the traditional self-referral or GP referral routes. The proportion of Criminal Justice System referrals and referrals from other drug services appear to have increased. The trend towards increasing referrals from 'other' routes, in part, reflects an increase in referrals of young people.

7.5 Trend in treatment completion

Table 7.5.1 shows the trend in the distribution of discharge reasons for those leaving treatment each year. Again, the method of data collection has changed during this period. However, there appears to have been an upward trend in the proportion of treatment episodes resulting in successful treatment completion, a reduction in premature treatment drop-out, and a reduction in the proportion of episodes where the reason for finishing treatment was not known. The increase in the proportion of episodes that ceased because the client was imprisoned is, perhaps, due to changing levels and patterns of Criminal Justice referral.

Table 7.4.1: Trend in source of referral into treatment between 2001/02 and 2006/07 (episodes)

Referral Source	2001/02 ¹ %	2003/04 ² %	2004/05 ² %	2005/06 ² %	2006/07 %
Statutory Drug service	6	9	8	9	10
Non-statutory Drug service	2	4	4	5	7
General Practice	18	17	15	13	11
Self Referral	47	43	41	37	34
Criminal Justice	19	17	19	22	24
Accident and Emergency	0	1	1	0	0
Syringe Exchange	0	0	0	0	0
Psychiatry	2	2	2	2	1
Community Care Assessment	0	0	1	1	1
Other	6	7	11	11	11
Total (episodes)	100	100	100	100	100

¹ Clients presenting for treatment, ² All clients

Table 7.5.1: Trend in reasons for discharge on episode completion between 2001/02 and 2006/07

Discharge Reason	2001/02	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Dropped out/left	53	59	42	43	39	33
Successful Completion	26	29	29	30	36	44
Treatment withdrawn/breach of contract	4	2	6	6	6	4
Prison	3	2	4	5	6	7
Other	2	1	6	8	5	5
Moved away	3	2	4	3	3	3
Not known	7	4	8	3	2	2
No appropriate treatment available	1	0	2	1	1	1
Died	1	0	1	1	1	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 7.5.2 (a & b) shows the trend in the reasons for successful discharge, by individual and episode counts, respectively. In 2006/07 there were 66,123 individuals who were discharged during the year and who did not have an episode of treatment ongoing on the 31st of March; of these, 27,513 were defined as having a successful discharge at their last treatment episode: 5,829 were reported to have completed treatment drug free, 13,022 to have completed treatment and 8,662 to have been referred on.

Table 7.5.2a: Trend in reasons for successful discharge of individuals between 2004/05 and 2006/07

	2004/05		2005/06		2006/07	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Treatment completed drug free	3,632	23	4,559	21	5,829	21%
Treatment completed	7,656	48	10,662	49	13,022	48%
Referred on	4,516	29	6,348	29	8,662	31%
Total	15,804		21,569		27,513	
<i>(Total discharged)</i>	<i>55,560</i>		<i>63,534</i>		<i>66,123</i>	

Table 7.5.2b: Trend in reasons for successful discharge of episodes between 2004/05 and 2006/07

	2004/05		2005/06		2006/07	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Treatment completed drug free	5,759	21	7,021	17	9,036	17
Treatment completed	12,012	43	16,705	41	20,329	41
Referred on	10,386	37	16,853	42	22,821	42
Total	28,157		40,579		52,186	

Appendix 1. Variable incompleteness and inconsistency

Please note the following analysis is based on all modality records that fall within an episode or that relate to an individual client. However, in constructing the source data for reporting only a subset of the modality records pertaining to each client or episode has been used (see Methodology section 3.1).

For the treatment year 2006/07 modality records have been analysed for completeness and consistency of selected variables. Older modality records from episodes of treatment that have continued into 2006/07 are unlikely to have been updated retrospectively since 2005/06. Thus, particular attention has been paid to the 170, 655 (46%) 'new' modality records for clients triaged during 2006/07.

A1.1 Variable Incompleteness

An NDTMS record is defined as incomplete in respect of a particular data field when no legitimate recorded value is provided for that field. There are several NDTMS fields that may go unrecorded for legitimate reasons. The following fields are, therefore, not analysed here for completeness: secondary drug, tertiary drug, modality end date, discharge reason and discharge date. Similarly, modality start date and modality type may legitimately not be recorded if a client, although triaged, was not assigned a modality or did not start the treatment modality that they were assigned. Although, postal sector of residence, PCT and DAT area of residence may also go unrecorded for legitimate reasons, these variables are analysed for completeness, as they are of particular interest in geographic analyses.

Figure A1.1.1 NDTMS Data Variable Incompleteness for 2006/07: Percentage of modality level records with a missing value: New modality records and all modality records.




Figure A1.1.1 shows, for selected variables of interest, the percentage of new modality records (those with a triage date during 2006/07) and the percentage of all modality records for which a legitimate value was not recorded. Note that, as stated above, the former percentages are based on the 170,655 new modality records whereas the latter percentages are based on all 370,354 modality records. The percentage values shown in the graphic are for the new modality records. Of the variables of interest, injecting status was the most incomplete, having been unrecorded in nearly one-fifth (17%) of new modality records. Ethnicity was the least incomplete, having been recorded in all but 2% of new modality records. For all modality records the corresponding percentages are of the same order of magnitude. Although not shown in Figure A1.1.1, DAT area of residence was recorded in all but 0.1% of new modality records and in all but 0.2% of all modality records.

Table A1.1.1 shows, for selected variables, the percentage of all and new modality level records for which a legitimate value was not recorded in the NDTMS data for 2006/07, by Region of treatment. For example, 38% of all modality records and 28% of new modality records from the South East Region included no details of client injecting status and 31% of all modality records and 26% of new modality records from the Yorkshire & The Humber Region did not record whether or not clients had been previously treated.

Table A1.1.1 NDTMS Data Variable Incompleteness during 2006/07: Percentage of modality level records with a missing value, by region of treatment

Region of treatment	% of modality records with item missing							
	Ethnicity		Route of admin. of main drug		Injecting status		Previously treated	
	All	New	All	New	All	New	All	New
North East	1	1	3	2	12	11	18	17
North West	2	2	6	4	10	10	12	12
Yorkshire & The Humber	4	5	15	10	29	25	31	26
East Midlands	1	1	5	5	18	17	9	9
West Midlands	5	1	2	1	6	5	3	3
East of England	4	2	13	9	27	25	10	9
London	2	2	8	8	19	19	11	9
South East	4	5	23	17	38	28	29	25
South West	1	1	9	9	17	15	22	21

A1.2 Variable Inconsistency

New modality records with a valid recorded value for a given variable were examined for each treatment episode and for each individual client to determine the extent of inconsistencies between the values assigned to the variable, values that should not change during the course of a treatment episode or for a client.

Table A1.2.1 NDTMS 2006/07: Inconsistencies in new modality level records

Variable	Number of clients/episodes with inconsistent data ¹	% of examined clients/episodes with inconsistent data
Ethnicity	2145 <i>clients</i>	2.1
Referral source	154 <i>episodes</i>	0.1
Main drug	121 <i>episodes</i>	0.1
Route of administration of main drug	84 <i>episodes</i>	0.1
Injecting status	37 <i>episodes</i>	< 0.1
Previously treated	156 <i>episodes</i>	0.1
Discharge date	51 <i>episodes</i>	0.1
Discharge reason	48 <i>episodes</i>	0.1

¹for which two or more different values were recorded for the same field amongst the modality records for the client/episode

A client-level variable or episode-level variable in the NDTMS data is defined to be inconsistent if it has two or more non-identical legitimate values amongst all the modality records for a client or for an episode of treatment respectively.

Inconsistency of a client-level variable, such as sex or ethnicity, is measured by the valid percentage of all clients who have two or more non-identical legitimate values for that variable amongst the respective modality records. Similarly, inconsistency of an episode-level variable, such as main drug or referral source, is measured by the valid percentage of all episodes which have two or more non-identical legitimate values for that variable amongst the respective modality records.

Table A1.2.1 summarises the level of inconsistency for several key variables amongst new modality records. Thus, for example, there were 2,145 clients, triaged during 2006/07, for each of whom at least two different values for ethnicity were reported and 154 episodes of treatment for each of which at least two different referral sources were reported.

These issues of data quality should be addressed by Regional Managers for the next reporting period.

Appendix 2. Notes on numbers in treatment series

1998/99 – Originally published as 100,000, based on a reduction from the original 2000/01 estimate (118,500). Now estimated as 85,000, based on a reduction from a revised estimate (102,100) of the 2000/01 census figure and with a reduction (1/1.03 – based on an analysis of 2003/04 data) for regional overlap¹.

1999/00 – Originally published as 109,000, based on based on a reduction from the original 2000/01 estimate (118,500). Calculated as a reduction from the revised 2000/01 estimate, as per the revised baseline estimate, the estimated figure is 91,000 (87,500 – 94,500).

2000/01 – Originally published as 118,500, based on treatment census. Taking into account problems with the original methodology, this has been revised to 102,100 (see “Re-examining the baseline for the number of persons in drug misuse treatment during 1998/99”) and can be further adjusted (1/1.03 – based on an analysis of 2003/04 data) to allow for regional overlap not accounted for in the revised figure, which gives an estimate of 99,000.

2001/02 – The Department of Health originally published a provisional figure of 128,200, based on the first year of NDTMS. If the published figure is adjusted to take account of regional overlap (1/1.03 – based on an analysis of 2003/04 data), a higher level of reporting by GPs (further 1/1.014 – based on a comparison of 2002/03 with 2003/04 data²) and inclusion of Tier Two agencies (further 1/1.056 – based on a comparison of 2002/03 with 203/04 data²), the resulting estimate is 116,000.

2002/03 - The Department of Health originally published a provisional figure of 140,900. This was based on a variety of methodological assumptions about the NDTMS data for 2002/03 which are known to have resulted in an inflated figure. The Bridging Exercise² concluded that, in order to produce comparable figures, it would be necessary to inflate the figures for the subsequent year from 125,913 to 153,806. If the 2002/03 figures are reduced by an equivalent proportion, the resulting estimate is 115,500.

¹ Re-examining the baseline for the number of persons in drug misuse treatment during 1998/99 (National Drug Evidence Centre, University of Manchester 2005)

² Bridging exercise comparing drug misuse treatment data 2002/03 and 2003/04 (National Drug Evidence Centre, University of Manchester 2005)

References

Weblinks are included for all references, when available

[NDTMS data on drug misusers in treatment 2003/04](#), NTA, London, September 2004.

Drugs strategy: [Tackling drugs to build a better Britain](#), 1998 and [Updated drug strategy 2002](#), Home Office, London 1998 and 2002.

[Models of care for drug misusers](#), NTA, London, December 2002.

[NTA core data set for star ratings data submission 2003/04](#), NTA, London, 2004.

[NDTMS reference data](#), NTA website, London, December 2004.

[CHAI - Data Quality and Process Document](#), NDEC, NTA, London, July 2004.

[Healthcare Commission: Data quality and process](#), NDEC, NTA, London, revised September 2004.

[Bridging exercise comparing drug misuse treatment data 2002/03 and 2003/04](#), NDEC, NTA, London, September 2004.

Department of Health statistical bulletin: [Statistics from the regional Drug Misuse Databases on drug misusers in treatment in England, 2000/01](#), Department of Health, London, December 2001.

Department of Health statistical bulletin: [Provisional statistics from the National Drug Treatment Monitoring System in England, 2001/02](#), Department of Health, London, December 2002.

Department of Health statistical bulletin: [Provisional statistics from the National Drug Treatment Monitoring System in England, 2001/02 and 2002/03](#), Department of Health, London, December 2003.

Donmall, M.C. (1999). UK Monitoring of Problem Drug Users: the Drug Misuse Database - A System Based on Regional Centres. *European Addiction Research*, 5: 185-190

Donmall, M.C., Hickman, M. & Glavas, R. (2000). [The New National Drug Treatment Monitoring System Part 1: Requirements](#) & [Part 2 Technical specification](#): A review consultancy for the Department of Health London, University of Manchester and Imperial College, London.

Millar, T., Gemmell, I., Hay, G., Heller, R. F., & Donmall, M. 2006, "How well do trends in incidence of heroin use reflect hypothesised trends in prevalence of problem drug use in the North West of England?", *Addiction Research & Theory*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 537-549